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FOREWORD

Makerere University has a rich history, having transformed from a College of the University of London to a world-class University. Over the years, the University has trained outstanding leaders in Africa and distinguished herself as an emerging centre of excellence in medicine, agricultural sciences and research, among others. With time the shift in policy on higher education funding culminated into liberalisation in the sub-sector. This has over the years affected the core functions of the higher education delivery systems with far reaching implications on socio-economic and policy development of the country. On the latter backdrop, there has been growing discontent at public institutions of higher learning, especially at Makerere University.

In November 2016, the Visitor and President of the Republic of Uganda appointed the Visitation Committee, 2016 to visit, study, make a situation analysis on causes of endemic strikes, assess progress on the implementation of previous reports, conduct an appraisal of the integrity of finance management and establish the student and staff numbers.

The Committee adopted an integrated approach to address the task including among others, desk reviews of relevant documentation, stakeholder interface, financial and other relevant audits, benchmarking and dialogue with the public.

The findings and recommendations presented in this Report are designed to enable Uganda’s higher education subsector in general and Makerere University in particular to address the developmental challenges of this country, the region and Africa. However, the effective and efficient implementation of these recommendations will require collective effort from Government, Makerere University and other stakeholders. When all this is done, Makerere University will be truly championing its Motto: “We Build for the Future” by actually bringing the future to the present.

Indeed, this is very evident given that one of its programmes called Resilient Africa Networks (RAN) has developed the first ever largest University-institutionalised Platform that involves 18 Universities spread across 13 African countries. The Platform is used as a conduit for engagements with cities and communities in Africa to generate contextualised knowledge and skills to inform resilience-driven innovations. The RAN lab manages a multidisciplinary portfolio of over 150 innovations, 75 of which have received seed funding to pilot, test and refine their solutions. While this and other initiatives by Staff and Students of Makerere University are commendable, they are still challenges that need to be addressed.

The Committee received maximum support from the Presidency, the Ministry of Education and Sports, National Council for Higher Education, Makerere University, and several universities in Uganda and abroad. The Committee is indebted to the team of specialists and research assistants co-opted to support the assignment.

On behalf of the Committee, I extend gratitude to H.E. the President and Visitor for entrusting us with this noble task.

Hon. Dr. Abel Rwendeire
CHAIRPERSON,
VISITATION COMMITTEE ON MAKERERE UNIVERSITY, 2016
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. BACKGROUND

The higher education sub-sector in Uganda has undergone major transformation influenced by national, regional and international developments. The notable ones include: the rapid growth in participation and increased demand for access to higher education, the increasing significance of research and innovation in the knowledge-based economy globally, the wider competition among higher education institutions and the influence of information technology. The above developments continue to mount unprecedented pressure on the higher education system in Uganda, amid relative reduction of government funding and constrained private subsidy.

As the demand for and acknowledgement of higher education as a key driver in economic development grows, ensuring that the higher education system is managed efficiently and effectively is a policy priority. Moreover, Uganda’s higher education system has become more complex, partly due to the growth in the number of public and private institutions and the multiple stakeholders, whose interests need balancing. Subsequently, the governance and management of the sub-sector has likewise become more challenging, more specialised and more demanding. Uganda therefore aspires to establish a resilient and vibrant higher education system that can sustainably contribute to the competitiveness of the economy in line with Vision 2040 and NDPII.

Universities in Uganda need to train the human capital with emphasis on skills development that is critical for the aspired socioeconomic transformation. Interventions to support such endeavor would among others entail: the review and development of strategic training and research programmes in line with the national development agenda, the use of modern technologies in the management processes and delivery of academic programmes, a focus on competence-based delivery approaches, the establishment of functional linkages between higher education institutions and the labour market, and finally but not least the implementation of a sustainable higher education funding model.

Public universities have increasingly faced challenges which have in the past necessitated the setting up of Committees and Task Forces, which included the McGregor Visitation Committee to Public Universities (2007) and the Omaswa Task Force (2014). Notwithstanding the latter efforts, there has been no abating to the escalation in discontent. Consequently, His Excellency the President of the Republic of Uganda in exercise of the powers vested in him as the Visitor by Section 26 of the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act 2001 as amended, appointed a nine (9) member Visitation Committee to look into the affairs of Makerere University. The appointment of the Committee followed the closure of the University on the 1st of November, 2016 by the Visitor, which action was triggered by ensuing uprisings by Staff and Students. The Committee was to examine these challenges, with a view to finding sustainable solutions.

B. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND APPROACH

The Terms of Reference (ToR) were:

(1) To visit, study and make a situation analysis of Makerere University and causes of endemic strikes including but not limited to academic affairs, financial affairs, governance affairs, and student affairs, and make recommendations.

(3) To study the three earlier Reports: the McGregor Visitation Committee, Omaswa, and Kabaasa Reports, and make actionable recommendations.

(4) To conduct a special audit in financial management practices of Makerere University and if necessary conduct a forensic audit.

(5) To conduct an audit in the population of students, teaching and non-teaching staff presently studying or working at Makerere in order to rule out “ghosts”.

The Committee adopted an integrated approach to address the task including among others, desk reviews of relevant documentation, stakeholder interface, financial and other relevant audits, benchmarking and dialogue with the public. The key findings are summarised under C.

C. KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Makerere University has since its inception significantly contributed to training the workforce needed for the socio-economic transformation of Uganda. The Committee immensely recognises that the University has registered a number of achievements in its core functions of teaching; research and innovations; and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking over time.

C.1 OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Makerere University is a household name on the regional and international scene. Indeed it has trained great leaders in the region and all public and private universities in Uganda are manned by products of Makerere University. The following are among the major recent outstanding achievements of the University:

(1) Makerere University is ranked 3rd in Africa by Times Higher Education World University Rankings, 2016/17. It has consistently maintained a relatively good ranking within the region and continent among its peers.

(2) The University has maintained the national share of about 21 percent of eligible A-level candidates admitted to both public and private universities in the country.

(3) The University has registered a notable increase in student enrolment on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) programmes from 16 percent in 2003 to 35 percent in 2015. This development aligns well with the national development agenda and the Presidential Initiative on Science and Technology Innovation.

(4) The library extension increased the seating capacity in the University Library by 50 percent, and digital library space increased to 3,009 in 2015/16 from 407 in 2008/09. The Library is stocked with current resources and has access to a global database of academic resources conducive for learning, teaching, research and innovation.

(5) There is remarkable increase in the number of students graduating from 5,123 Bachelor’s Degrees and 546 Graduate Degrees in 2008 to 12,727 Bachelor’s Degrees and 1,466 Graduate Degrees in 2017, respectively.
A significant increase in the number of academic staff publications, i.e. over 7,150 publications between 2010 and 2016.

Makerere University is an icon in research and innovation on the national, regional and international levels, especially in the fields of Medicine, Agriculture and value addition, Engineering and Natural Sciences. There have been significant achievements registered by the University including attracting research funds from several development partners and expanding her research networks and collaborations. The Committee reports over 10 internationally accredited Centres of Excellence active at Makerere by 2017, besides spin-offs such as Kiira Motors and the emerging Banana industrial platform under the Presidential Initiative for Science & Technology Innovation.

The University maintains the top share of academic staff with PhDs in the Country and in Africa. The number of staff with PhDs increased from 469 in 2008 to 790 in 2016.

The successful implementation of the gender inclusion policy which has raised female access to approximately 40 percent.

The sustenance of attraction for competitive research grants some of which have contributed to capacity building, infrastructural expansion and spin-offs.

The innovation of parallel systems of funding to compliment government-reduced subvention.

C.2 KEY CHALLENGES

Notwithstanding the above positive developments, the Committee noted several issues that Makerere University and the Higher Education Sub-Sector in Uganda have to respond to with well conceptualised reforms. The challenges stem from the need for the higher education sub-sector to:

i. Achieve a level of quality that stands the test of international comparison with relevance and excellence,

ii. Improve governance and management accountability, and

iii. Diversify sources of funding.

The challenges at the University cause frustration and discontent among Staff and Students, and predispose the University to endemic strikes, which affect her core operations and dent her image both locally and internationally. The Committee found the following key issues that need to be addressed:

1. Deficient National Higher Education Strategy, Structures and Systems

The Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 expired and has neither been reviewed nor replaced, creating a gap on higher education. The Education Sector Investment Plan also expired and has not been reviewed. Further, public universities are not collectively coordinated to deliver complimentary value to the Nation. This could partly be due to the fact that the Ministry of Education and Sports has a very wide mandate covering: Pre-Primary, Special Needs Education, Primary Education, Secondary Education, Teacher Training, Business, Technical & Vocational Education and Training, and Higher Education that may limit capacity for effective supervision and oversight of higher education.

The composition, structure and funding of the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) limit its capacity to regulate higher education. The UOTIA, 2001 as amended,
provides for constituency-based membership of the NCHE where members nominate the Chairperson and elect the Vice Chairperson. This system inevitably creates conflict of interest. It has been observed for instance that some members of the Council, including the Chairperson are drawn from the same universities they regulate. Further, there is no open and transparent criterion for selecting representatives of the public on the Council of NCHE.

The Committee noted the vague lines of authority, for instance the Vice Chancellor not being the Accounting Officer of a public University, the relationship between the Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs and the Academic Registrar; amongst other. Under the Law, provision for the lines of authority of the key University Executives results into conflicting discharge of powers.

(2) Inadequate Governance, Leadership and Management

The composition of Makerere University Council with over 50 percent non-independent members (Staff and Students) results into conflict of interest clouding objectivity.

The system of election of University Executives, College Principals, School Deans and Heads of Departments is divisive and has failed to deliver the minimum required leadership. This practice often results into polarisation of the University Community due to: caucusing, management indecision and gaps in management accountability.

The current search practice results into inbreeding because it makes it difficult for competitive candidates outside Makerere University to be selected through this system.

(3) Weak Structures for Engagement of Students, Staff, Parents/Guardians, and other Key Stakeholders

The structures and systems for engagement of key stakeholders of Makerere University are weak and in most cases non-functional; for example, inadequate consultation prior to fees increment, among others. As such, Staff and Students resort to strikes as a platform for drawing the attention of University leadership and Government. The Committee further observed that the University does not have a system for engaging parents/guardians but holds students personally responsible for fees payment.

(4) Inadequate Deployment of Information Technology

Makerere University has chronic challenges resulting from heavily human-supported systems. Consequently, Student and Staff numbers are not known. The Committee found gross malfeasance in: academic records management including missing and changing students’ marks, financial and human resource records.

The Committee observed the limited integration of Information Technology (IT) in teaching, learning and monitoring of processes on the backdrop of obsolete and fragmented IT systems, among others.

(5) Unsustainable Funding Model for Higher Education in Uganda

The shift in policy on higher education funding which culminated into liberalisation in the sub-sector with a mix of public funding, private sponsorship and support from development partners has not adequately supported the core functions of the higher education delivery systems.

The Auditor General’s Report – Unit Cost Study of Education at Public Universities in Uganda (May, 2010) established that the actual student unit cost per year ranged between UGX 10.2 million (Faculty of Medicine) and UGX 3.8 million (Institute of Adult and Continuing Education). This Report, in addition to other Reports by NCHE and Makerere
University were not implemented. The Committee found that as of August 2016, the tuition charged per student from East Africa and South Sudan per year at Makerere University ranged between UGX 3,104,000 (Bachelor of Biomedical Sciences) and UGX 1,344,000 (Bachelor of Education). In contrast, a student of the Bachelor of Medicine/Bachelor of Surgery at the University of Nairobi currently pays the equivalent of UGX 15,963,000 per year. Also noteworthy, the fee charges per child in competitive primary and secondary schools in Uganda are over UGX 1,000,000 per term.

It was further observed that the aggregate contribution of the obtaining Government financing schemes for students, i.e.: Government sponsorship, Statehouse scholarship and the loan scheme is not comprehensively addressing the need for equitable access to higher education by all qualifying candidates.

In addition, the current 0.5 percent of GDP government funding for graduate training and research is still at variance with the strategic objectives of Vision 2040 and NDP II. Consequently, graduate training and research is privately funded.

Makerere University has taken initiatives to explore diversifying sources of revenue through investments leveraging the real-estate base, commercialisation of research and innovations and establishing endowment funds. However these efforts are yet to yield significant results.

(6) Inadequate Management Accountability

The Committee noted several weaknesses which reflect inadequacies in financial management, procurement, asset management and grants management resulting into financial loss at Makerere University.

(7) Deteriorating Quality of Teaching and Learning

There were several approved academic-related policies in place. However, the Committee found evidence of non-adherence to the policies and inadequate monitoring of teaching and learning processes (e.g. some academic staff not fulfilling their set obligations).

Although the average Student-Staff ratio at Makerere University is estimated at 1:27, COBAMS, CEES and COCIS have ratios in excess of 1:50 on the backdrop of unmatched scholarly infrastructure and limited essential materials.

The Committee noted inadequacy in the involvement of the NCHE, professional bodies and employers in the periodic accreditation of systems, structures and programmes at Makerere University.

Furthermore, there was fragmentation and duplication of undergraduate programmes with no justification based on unique market-value, which compromises the quality of services. Premature specialisation limits the career growth trajectory for the graduates.

The duplication of programmes at public universities was also noted; for example the case of Makerere University Business School (MUBS) and College of Business and Management Sciences (COBAMS).

(8) Limited Development of Indigenous Knowledge and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships

Makerere University lacks a comprehensive policy to guide the development of indigenous knowledge and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking. This is further complicated by the lack of a nationally-funded research agenda and the allocation of less than one percent of the University’s internally generated income to research, innovations and knowledge
transfer and networks. It was noted that all undergraduate students contribute UGX 20,000 towards the research fund annually.

(9) Challenges in Work and Study Environment

Makerere University faces challenges in the fulfillment of her core functions due to constant interruption of programmes from incessant Student and Staff strikes; limited teaching materials; insufficient support for laboratory and fieldwork; inadequate learning space, dilapidated infrastructure, obsolete and insufficient work equipment (laboratories, computers, projectors, etc.); poor hygiene and sanitation; shared office space; physical insecurity; limited institutional support for staff development; and lack of robust performance management systems.

(10) Student Discontent and Triggers of Strikes

The Committee established that Students were highly discontented with respect to the fees policy and charges, and examinations and results managements. However, there was general discontent resulting from: Staff strikes, absenteeism of some Staff, sexual harassment, and key welfare issues including security, physical infrastructure, sanitation and meals. The insensitivity of infrastructure towards the disabled was also noted.

C.3 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee after thorough consideration and analysis of the above challenges made the following key recommendations on:

(1) National Higher Education Strategy, Structures and Systems

a) The Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 review process should be fast-tracked taking into account: the national manpower requirements, the global and continental developments, the national development agenda, and relevance of higher education programmes.

b) The resulting Strategic Plan 2018/19-2027/28 should inform public policy on higher education and strategic plans for all higher education institutions.

c) The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation should be restructured so as to extend its mandate to include higher education. Government should subsequently put in place a sustainable funding strategy for the higher education sub-sector and NCHE.

d) The composition of the Council for NCHE should be reviewed to comprise 13 members (including the Chairperson) selected based on the requisite competencies and experience rather than constituencies.

e) The Council Members of the NCHE should be appointed by the Minister responsible for higher education.

f) The NCHE Executive Director should be appointed by the Minister on recommendation of the NCHE.

g) NCHE should make regulations to operationalise the UOTIA 2001, as amended so as to bridge the existing gaps.

h) The Vice Chancellors of public universities should be appointed by the Minister responsible upon recommendation of the respective University Councils. Such appointment should be based on stringent performance contracts.

i) The Government should leverage the premier brand of Makerere University to restructure the public universities into a National Public University System similar to the Indian Institute of Technology, University of Malaysia, Monash University in Australia, University of Michigan, University of California or University of
London Systems. This would progressively transform public universities established upcountry into upcountry Colleges of Makerere University. For example, Muni University would become Makerere University Muni and Busitema University would become Makerere University Busitema.

j) Decongest Makerere University by transferring undergraduate programmes in COBAMS to MUBS; CEES to Kyambogo University and CHUSS to Nsamizi Institute of Social Development. The remnant Colleges should then focus on graduate training and research. Additionally, virtual platforms should be fully utilised to deliver programmes to offsite Students.

(2) Council and Top Management

The Committee noted that universities are typically governed using the corporate governance principal. The following are the key recommendations:

a) The Council of a public university should be composed of fifteen (15) members. Of these, nine (9) should be independent members (from outside the university with knowledge, competencies and experience in key areas of higher education governance), a representative of the Convocation, the Vice Chancellor as an ex-officio, one representative of Academic Staff as an ex-officio, one representative of Non-teaching staff as an ex-officio, one representative of Graduate Students as an ex-officio, and one representative of Undergraduate Students as an ex-officio.

b) The membership to Council should be based on competencies required for Council business rather than on constituency basis.

c) Membership should be a 4 years term renewable only once.

d) The Vice Chancellor should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Accounting Officer of a Public University.

e) The role of the University Secretary should be redefined to Director Legal and Secretary to University Council (Corporation Secretary).

(3) Structures for engagement of Students, Staff, Parents/Guardians, and other Key Stakeholders

Makerere University should establish a streamlined strategy for stakeholder engagement.

(4) Utilisation of Information Technology (IT)

a) The University should apply current generation IT to enhance business process efficiency and effectiveness in the management of admissions, registration, teaching and learning, academic records, human resource, procurement, finances, communication and stakeholder engagement, among others.

b) The University’s information systems should be integrated to secure the integrity of data, especially Students’ academic and financial records, as well as Human Resource records and the payroll.

(5) Funding Model for Higher Education in Uganda

a) The unit cost of training a Student should be established.

b) The University should recover the unit cost of training a Student by having the fees payable being equal to the total cost of training a Student.

c) The Government sponsorship and Statehouse scholarship should be consolidated into the existing loan scheme and made accessible to all national qualifying
candidates irrespective of discipline of study in both public and private institutions in Uganda.

d) Government should increase funding for research and graduate training in line with the strategic objectives of Vision 2040 and NDP II.

e) Makerere University should strengthen initiatives to explore diverse sources of revenue through investment leveraging the real-estate base, commercialisation of research and innovations and establishing endowment funds.

(6) Management Accountability

a) Money lost due to irregular financial practices should be recovered.

b) The University should comply with the Law governing public financial management, accountability, procurement and disposal of public assets.

c) The IGG should investigate the financial malfeasance highlighted in the Report with the view to recovering lost funds and bringing the culpable to book.

(7) Quality of Teaching and Learning

a) Makerere University should enforce Staff and Students’ compliance with academic policies to enhance the quality of services.

b) The accreditation of systems, structures and programmes at Makerere University should involve comprehensive stakeholder engagement including professional bodies, employers, among others.

c) The restructuring of programmes should be fast-tracked to eliminate duplication, fragmentation and premature specialisation; and ensure relevance to the national development agenda.

d) The Line Ministry should set up an Inter-University Working Group for National Curriculum Mapping to study the status of the current academic programmes in public universities and restructure them accordingly.

(8) Development of Indigenous Knowledge and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTPs) and networking

a) The KTPs Unit should be operationalised.

b) A Patents and Licensing Office should be established.

c) Industry attachment programmes for academic staff should be established.

d) University Career Centre(s) should be established to link students and graduates to the labour market, and equip them with the right tools and essential soft skills required for professional practice.

e) The Internship Programme should be reviewed during the curriculum restructuring process.

(9) Work and Study Environment

a) The University should develop and implement an annual maintenance plan as part of the annual work plan and budget.

b) The building of the perimeter wall at Makerere University should be fast tracked.

c) The identification system for Students, Staff and Visitors should be streamlined.
d) The boundaries of all University land should be opened and proper documentation obtained.

(10) Management of Student Affairs and Services

a) The University should institute structures for engendering meaningful dialogue with students.

b) The University should establish a mechanism for engaging Alumni, Development Partners, the private sector and other stakeholders to raise funds for supporting critical Student welfare requirements.

c) The University should streamline systems for the efficient and effective management of: students’ identification (IDs), internal examination, external examination of graduate dissertations and theses, certification and attendant grievances.

D. IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

An independent task force to streamline Makerere University should be set up. In view of the fact that the University is grappling with deficiencies in governance and management, it is recommended that a Makerere University Independent Transformation Task Force (MUTTF) be set up by Government for a period of three (3) - five (5) years. Specifically the Taskforce shall:

(1) Develop a twenty (20) years’ comprehensive Operational Viability Analysis (OVA) [strategic goals, strategy, governance and management structures, legal framework, required resources, job analysis, cost structures and revenue streams].

(2) Develop an Implementation Plan for Makerere University Reforms, and

(3) Provide strategic oversight for the implementation of the Plan including the recommendations of the Rwendeire Committee.

The Taskforce should be composed of up to seven (7) members with competences in corporate governance, legal, finance, strategic planning, human resource management, ICT and higher education curriculum development. The Taskforce should be housed in the Ministry responsible for higher education.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The trajectory of African socio-economic development was historically based on the quest for better ways to address the basic human needs: food, water and shelter. The first species of humans was the *homo habilis*, which evolved in Sub-Saharan Africa around 2,500,000 BC. The *homo habilis* were known mainly for making stone tools to enhance hunting and gathering processes, as such, this era was termed as the beginning of the stone age. The stone age is documented to having been a three stage metamorphosis: The Old Stone Age also known as the *Paleolithic* where humans were pre-dominantly hunter-gatherers; the Middle Stone Age also known as the *Mesolithic*, where humans transitioned into agricultural life planting food to improve food security using basic stone tools; and the New Stone Age also known as the *Neolithic*, where humans consolidate agriculture for subsistence including animal farming. The evolution of the modern day humans, the *homo sapiens* is said to have taken place around 200,000 BC in Sub-Saharan Africa. A key characteristic of this evolution is the way knowledge generated was passed on from generation to generation through well conceptualised systems of apprenticeship in many cases focusing on the family unit where the elders taught their children how to gather, hunter, practice agriculture, traditional medicine amongst other essentials for sustaining livelihood.

The discovery of fire around 60,000 BC enabled the *Neolithic* to now take charge of spaces like caves for shelter and also the cooking/roasting of food. This also marked the birth of urbanisation and Eurasia which is responsible for modern day civilization and major milestones in agriculture with exceptional supply of domesticatable plants and animals. Domesticatable animals were particularly striking, these included goats, sheep, pigs, horses, and cattle (among others); notably, the latter two animals could be harnessed for heavy labour, including ploughing which amplified farming production and transportation.

The Eurasian Bronze Age, 3000-1000 BC was a key development to enhance tooling and weapon making. The Bronze Age was mainly confined to Eurasia and North Africa. It is not surprising that the advent of the Iron Age in 1000 BC was first experienced in South West Asia spreading to the rest of Eurasia and North Africa by 500 BC. Unlike the Bronze Age, the Iron Age diffused through Sub-Saharan Africa along the mighty Nile River due to the abundance of Iron as opposed to copper enabling advancements in agriculture, warfare and general civilization through mass production of tools and weapons.

It is important to note that Sub-Saharan Africa was a key player in these developments. The scramble for Africa by European imperialists between 1881 and 1914 which was facilitated by the many tribal groups (kingdoms & chiefdoms) served to aid the abandonment of the development of indigenous knowledge. This was on the backdrop of the transatlantic slave trade which had taken place from the 15th through the 19th centuries. These extractionist expeditions did not only deprive Africa of human resource and mineral resource but also changed the destiny of Africa in terms of development of indigenous knowledge as they advanced technology and knowledge developed in Europe as superior and the preferred way for deriving livelihood.

Africa had taken serious strides in education. The University of Al-Qarawiyyin established in 859AD in Fes, Morocco is the oldest existing, continually operating and the first degree awarding educational institution in the world according to UNESCO and Guinness World Records. In the 12th century, the University of Timbuktu in Mali had an attendance of 25,000 students in a city which had a population of 100,000 people. The students came from all corners of the African continent in search of excellence in knowledge and trade. The question
then is how come today Africa is playing catch up on almost all fronts. Africa has missed out on being a major player in advancing the steam and internal combustion engines and mechanization; the development of advanced weapons building on the invention of gun powder; the electronic and information technology age amongst many other modern day ground breaking advancements. Consequently Africa has become a consumerism society.

The Universities is Africa have pre-dominantly embraced foreign knowledge and continue to advance western technology while placing dismal effort on the preservation and development of indigenous knowledge and technology. This has constrained Africa’s competitiveness in the global knowledge economy. This calls for strengthening higher education in Africa with well conceptualised reforms to meet the ingredient imperatives for relevance and excellence placing emphasis on the development of indigenous knowledge for competitiveness in the global knowledge economy. In addition, governments should play a central role in shaping strategies aligned to their national development agenda.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The higher education sub-sector in Uganda has undergone major transformation influenced by national, regional and international developments. Notable among these is the rapid growth in participation and increased demand for access to higher education, the increasing importance of research and innovation in the global and knowledge-based economy, wider competition among higher education institutions and the influence of information technology. However, these developments continue to mount unprecedented pressure on the higher education system in Uganda, amid a relative reduction of government funding and limited private subsidy. Consequently, the constraints of centrally managing a system that needs to be flexible and responsive have become more pronounced.

As the demand for higher education grows and as governments acknowledge their role in promoting economic development, ensuring that the higher education system is managed efficiently and effectively is a matter of policy priority. Moreover, Uganda’s higher education system has become more complex, partly due to the growth in the number of public and private institutions and the multiple stakeholders whose interests need balancing. Subsequently, the governance and management of the subsector has become more challenging, more specialised and more demanding.

There is equally need for a well understood sustainable governance strategy for the higher education subsector clearly articulating the role of Government, the Governance Councils, University Management, Academic and Administrative Staff as well the biggest constituents-the Students. In higher education governance, the principles of autonomy provide the subsector with unique opportunity space to collectively contribute to national development while protecting the reputation of the national higher education system for global competitiveness.

The African Union Commission’s Agenda 2013-2063 and the Continental Education Strategy for Africa (2016-2025) have been driven by the need for an integrated, prosperous and peaceful Africa; supported by its own citizens that are locally relevant and globally competitive. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) requirements for equitable and quality education place new demands on higher education institutions. Consistent with the existing continental and global frameworks, Uganda’s Vision 2040 and the National Development Plan II (NDPII) espouse a differentiated higher education system that can prepare graduates capable of functioning in the knowledge-economy informed by the principles of inclusiveness and sustainable growth.
Despite these frameworks and strategic investments in higher education as a vehicle for socio-economic transformation, quality and relevant higher education still remains a concern on the African Continent in general and in Uganda, in particular. According to the 2016-2017 Global Competitiveness Report (World Economic Forum, 2016) Uganda is ranked 129th out of the 139 participating countries on the 5th Pillar: Higher Education and Training. In terms of education and skills, skills of the current workforce and skills of the future workforce, it is ranked in the 121st, 119th and 123rd positions, respectively, lagging behind Rwanda and Kenya. Further, Uganda is ranked in the 90th position in terms of quality of education and the 77th with regard to Innovation and 104th in terms of intellectual property protection.

Education is seen on one hand as a process of development, and on the other, as a crucial input to the development agenda of any country. Countries with good education systems perform better on indicators of human development such as health status, maternal and infant mortality, lower population growth and reduced crime. Education is correlated with several social development outcomes like health, fertility choices, the ability to develop, learn or adapt new technologies, build institutions; and it undoubtedly creates a sense of nationhood. While the Committee’s concern was primarily on Makerere University in particular, and the higher education subsector in general, a collective systematic approach ought to target all levels of education because these have both a direct and indirect impact on the higher education subsector.

Until the mid-1990s the role of higher education in Africa’s development was fairly anomalous, with majority of the education development projects focused either on primary or secondary education. International donors and partners regarded universities, for the most part, as institutional enclaves neglecting the peculiar development needs of African communities. However, current research shows that the returns on investment from higher education are not only on the increase but also surpass those of the other levels of education. This is contrary to the evidence generated in the 1960s and 1970s where returns to primary education were considered higher. There is evidence that countries which have expanded systems of higher education with higher levels of investment in Research and Development (R&D) activities have higher potential to grow faster in the globalised knowledge economy.

In Uganda, higher education has grown in numerical terms from slightly less than 20 licensed higher education institutions in 1986 to 214 in 2016; and from one university before 1986 (Makerere University) to 47 in 2016. The enrolment in the subsector has increased from under 10,000 in 1986 to 247,437 students, with 44% female compared to 56% males. Over half (50.2%) of the students are enrolled in public universities compared to 49.8% in private universities. As the demand for higher education continues to grow and as society acknowledges its role in economic development, it becomes increasingly important to ensure that higher education systems are managed in an effective way.

Global monitoring reports have recently recorded how education reforms in several countries faced multiple and complex challenges that required long-term vision, political will and ability to innovate. In addition, such efforts require the financial resources to support the implementation of effective education policies. Systems for managing and governing higher education are becoming more complex partly due to the number of public and private institutions, which have made the task of managing and monitoring the sector more demanding. At a time when resources are scarce and needs are substantial and varied, it is critical that policymakers have quick and easy access to evidence on the impact of policies and programmes designed to improve education outcomes. High quality evidence is needed to support the decision-making processes and to make the case for the use of public funds.
Makerere University has since its inception significantly contributed to training the workforce needed for the socio-economic transformation of Uganda. The Makerere University Strategic Plan 2007/8 -20017/18 was developed with the view of repositioning the University to focus on learner-centred pedagogy; research and innovation; and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking. This necessitated new ways of action including but not limited to the need to continually rethink the University curriculum for a highly-diversified student population and society, the urgency to embrace transformative pedagogical approaches such as competence-based education and training, blended and online modes of delivery, and exploring innovative approaches to graduate research and training. Indeed, the distribution of current academic programmes suggests a growing niche in the provision of graduate research and training.

The University however faces numerous challenges in governance, leadership and management, human resource management, integration of Information Technology in key business processes, the management of its three core functions, i.e. teaching, research and innovations, and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking, and the management of students’ affairs amidst perennial financial constraints. These challenges cause frustration and discontent among Staff and Students and therefore predispose the University to endemic strikes affecting its core functions, in which Students and Staff are mandated to primarily engage. Incessant strikes have negatively affected the pursuit of her core functions and dented the image of the University, both locally and internationally.

Notwithstanding the challenges, Makerere University has registered a number of achievements in its core functions of teaching, research and innovations, and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking over time. The following are among the major recent outstanding achievements:

(1) Makerere University is ranked 3rd in Africa by Times Higher Education World University Rankings, 2016/17.

(2) the University has maintained the national share of about 21% of eligible A-level candidates admitted to both public and private universities in the country.

(3) the University has registered a notable increase in student enrolment on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) programmes from 16% in 2003 to 35% in 2015. This development aligns well with the national development agenda and the Presidential Initiative for on Science and Technology Innovation.

(4) with the Library extension, the seating capacity in the University Library has increased by 50%, and digital library space increased to 3,009 in 2015/16 from 407 in 2008/09. The Library is stocked with current resources and has access to a global data base of academic resources conducive for learning, teaching, research and innovations.

(5) a noticeable increase in the number of students graduating from 5,123 Bachelor’s Degrees and 546 Graduate Degrees in 2008 to 12,727 Bachelor’s Degrees and 1,466 Graduate Degrees in 2017.

(6) an increase in the number of academic staff publications, i.e. over 7,197 publications between 2010 and 2016.

(7) Makerere University is an icon in research and innovation at national, regional and international levels, especially in the fields of Medicine, Agriculture, Engineering and Natural Sciences. There have been significant achievements registered by the University including attracting research funds from several development partners and expanding her research networks and collaborations. The Committee reports over 10 internationally accredited Centres of Excellence active at Makerere by 2017, besides
spin-offs such as Kiira Motors and the emerging Banana industrial platform under the Presidential Initiative for Science and Technology Innovation.

(8) The University maintains the top share of academic staff with PhDs in the Country and Africa. The number of staff with PhDs increased from 469 in 2008 to 790 in 2016.

(9) The successful implementation of the gender inclusion policy which has raised female access to approximately 40%.

(10) The sustenance of attraction for competitive research grants some of which have led to staff capacity building, infrastructural expansion and spin-offs.

(11) The innovation of parallel systems of funding to compliment government-reduced subvention.

Higher Education has witnessed numerous reforms in line with broader public sector and economic reforms that most countries adopted since the 1980s to meet the expectations of New Public Management (NPM). These reforms considered the private sector as a key driver in the delivery of core services, traditionally a preserve of the public sector. Uganda was not an exception to these reforms, and Makerere University equally reformed its systems especially the introduction of fee-paying students. While reforms at Makerere initially helped the University move “back from the brink” and later helped increase enrolment; improved staff salaries, working and living conditions; arrested staff depletion; improved the market relevance of courses and reduced reliance on Government funds, the complexity of the University systems and the declining Government funding were later to crop up. These have always been fingered for the governance crisis at the University. Decline in funding of the University has been blamed for the rampant strikes, declining staff motivation, student unrest, and the decline in infrastructure and research undertakings.

Makerere University derives its funding from three major sources: Government, internally generated funds (IGFs), and development partners. Government and IGFs are the dominant sources of funding. Government’s recurrent funding is tagged on the government-sponsored students, who currently comprise 17% of the student population. This implies that the bulk of the funding is from privately-sponsored students. However, on average Makerere University charges about One Million Uganda Shillings per semester, per student within the East African Community and from South Sudan. For instance, on programmes such as the Bachelor of Education, the semester tuition fee is UGX. 400,000. This tuition is lower than the unit cost for students at the University as observed in previous studies including the Auditor General (2010) and NCHE (2010). The cost is also much lower compared to what is charged within the East African region. For instance, a student of the Bachelor of Medicine/Bachelor of Surgery at the University of Nairobi currently pays the equivalent of UGX 15,963,000 per year in contrast to a student doing the same course at Makerere University who pays UGX 3,104,000. Also noteworthy, the fee charges per child in competitive primary and secondary schools in Uganda are over UGX 1,000,000 per term, which are much higher than the average cost of studying at Makerere University.

To strengthen the funding base of the University, several long-term interventions are in place, including the operationalisation of the Makerere University Holdings Company and the Endowment Fund. The extent to which these interventions have been effectively implemented will be evaluated in the later chapters of this Report. Beyond mere accusation of Government funding as the source of problems at Makerere University, an understanding of the changing nature of university governance, the various models for understanding this...
changing nature and how developments in advocated models account for the situation at Makerere University provides an appropriate context for analysis.

His Excellency the President of the Republic of Uganda in exercise of the powers vested in him as the Visitor of Makerere University by Section 26 of the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act 2001 as amended, appointed a nine (9) member Visitation Committee to look into the affairs of Makerere University. The appointment of the Visitation Committee followed the closure of the University on 1st of November 2016 by the Visitor, which action was triggered by the strike of the Makerere University Academic Staff Association (MUASA) members. The Academic Staff were later joined by the Students who rioted demanding to be taught. This development prompted immediate indefinite closure of Makerere University to save life and property. The Visitation Committee was to examine these challenges, with a view to finding sustainable solutions.

In undertaking this important exercise, the Visitation Committee recognised that the main mandate of a university goes beyond generating knowledge through scholarship and research endeavours, to the wholesome process of educating thoughtful, caring citizens who have the skills and motivation to contribute to the advancement of the well-being and prosperity of individuals and communities. The Committee was conscious that to attain this mission, the University Staff, Managers and Governors need to have a unity of purpose and core values, attitudes and a culture of transformation of society.

The Committee adopted an integrated approach to address the task including among others, desk reviews of relevant documentation, stakeholder interface, financial and other relevant audits, benchmarking and dialogue with the public. In undertaking this exercise, the Committee was enjoined to report on the progress so far made in the implementation of the recommendations of the previous Visitations.

The findings and recommendations presented in this Report require collective efforts from Government, the University Council, Management, Staff, Students and other stakeholders for efficient and effective implementation that will cause critical transformation in the Uganda Higher Education system generally, and Makerere University in particular.

The Report is structured around nine (9) chapters. In chapter one the Committee presents an introduction and contextual overview of the assignment. Chapter two focuses on the methodology adopted by the Committee to realise the assignment. Chapters three to eight cover the findings and recommendations on governance and management; academic affairs; student affairs; financial management and utilisation of IT at Makerere University. In chapter nine the Committee presents an action plan to guide the implementation of the recommendations.

1.3 THE CHANGING NATURE OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

At the time of independence, most of the African countries heavily relied on external experts to manage the economy and this led to the idea of ‘development universities’. Public universities had a critical role in development to meet the human resource needs of the independent economies. During and after the national liberation struggles, there was serious effort to Africanise the management and administration of most institutions including universities. Higher education institutions had a critical role of indigenising (nationalising) development. Many newly independent countries did not have universities to provide training to high-level professional staff needed to replace the expatriates and hence these countries relied on sending persons abroad for training.
The establishment of national universities in many instances helped train nationals and indigenise development. The indigenisation of educational development implied indigenising teaching staff, curricula, and language at the different levels of education. During the 1970s and 1980s, the State enjoyed a virtual monopoly in the development of higher education as a post-independence agenda. Public funding and government control of universities characterised the structure of governance during this period. It was common in many countries for the Head of State to become the Chancellor of a major national University. Up till the 1980s, most universities in Africa had less challenges of governance due to favorable State policies and funding. Such universities benefited from modest State sponsorship and enjoyed considerable degree of autonomy.

In the early 1990s, universities in Africa were in a state of despair. The turning point was the corporatisation of universities which itself was a result of the broad World Bank public sector reforms which favored market-based management systems and use of governance models akin to the private sector. University leaders were expected to act, behave and reason as business entrepreneurs and the University became a seller of products, i.e. knowledge and skills. Governance reforms allowed universities to design their own survival strategies and privatisation measures. Cost recovery and income-generating activities were regarded as the quickest solutions to help many universities survive. Government funding drastically reduced and the post-independence agenda of indigenisation was lost to the market forces. The reduced role of the State in provision and funding encouraged a shift from “State-control” to a “State-supervision” governance model and encouraged market logic in higher education decision making.

Public funds to universities were now being allocated on the basis of market principles, and yet markets in higher education are very often not confined to for-profit entities. Some countries embarked on establishing different expert groups on higher education. Across countries, markets became a dear and mediating force while governance structures and decision-making processes encouraged market-friendly reforms.

In terms of changes in the governance of public institutions, ministries of education reduced their powers mostly to overall policy, strategic planning, coordination, and fund negotiations with other ministries (of finance) and foreign agencies. Many governments transferred the responsibility of higher education and its governance to the provincial level, delegated powers to buffer organisations, and granted autonomy to institutions. In Uganda’s case, the creation of the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) as a regulator of higher education institutions was conceived and implemented. In the process, the State became one of the many actors rather than the sole actor in providing and managing higher education.

Universities became autonomous, government interventions and administrative controls were replaced by incentive systems and accountability measures to steer institutions to achieve their missions. Within this environment, the task of managing the higher education subsector has become more specialised and demanding. This has increased the need for new management models that focus on monitoring and performance review, where the governance, financial management, infrastructural development, relevance and quality of the academic programmes, particularly, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) vis-à-vis national needs, the capacity of staff, and enrolment rates and quality of students should be well-streamlined.

Institutional leadership, much as it has historically not been very effective in most higher education institutions around the world, is now considered a critical determining factor for success of any university. Indeed, no country can develop a strong higher education system without a strong leadership pool of well-oriented and committed members of the regulatory,
oversight and management systems. While institutional leaders now increasingly operate in very complex and interconnected environments which impact on their decision-making processes and the outcomes of their decisions, the effectiveness of governance strategies varies primarily based upon the quality of leadership. Leaders in contemporary higher education institutions require the right set of values and behaviours as balancing the interests of Students and Staff is a critical leadership quality. For example, while Students are central to the governance of universities and development of quality procedures in higher education institutions, they need to occupy a marginal role as political actors in the discussion of university governance.

1.4 ROLE OF A UNIVERSITY IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Higher education institutions, both universities and tertiary, public and private are at the helm of economic development through their contribution to professional training (Engineers, Medical Doctors, Teachers, Scientists, Layers, Accountants, etc.); production of knowledge (Research & Innovation); ideological apparatus – producers of values, identity and social legitimation; and selection of the dominant elites. These roles are however effectively performed by high ranking universities which are connected to three factors: concentration of talent, abundant funding and appropriate governance. The central feature in this instance is the creation and concentration of a team of talented human resources in a university and the attraction of funding from the State and Non-state actors.

The Uganda Vision 2040 places great importance on developing a skilled and creative workforce to be able to harness the numerous opportunities available to Uganda, especially with regard to natural resources and industrialisation. Therefore, higher education is expected to contribute to knowledge generation and innovation to make Uganda a highly competitive Country so as to attain meaningful socio-economic transformation. The Uganda Vision 2040 anticipates that the Government would, “pursue policies aimed at leapfrogging especially in the areas of Science, Technology, innovation, and engineering; human resource development; public sector management; and private sector development.”

The Government shall also, “develop and implement a National Science Technology and Engineering System that would help in initiating, importing, modifying and diffusing new technologies.” In support of this innovation system, “government will establish innovation financing by introducing special grants, loan and guarantee for start-ups and new firms as well as subsidies and tax incentives to stimulate research and development in the public and private sector...”

Uganda’s participation rate in higher education as measured by the Higher Education Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) is about 8% compared to Ghana’s 12% and South Africa’s 20%. The higher education Gross Enrolment Ratios for Kenya and Tanzania are similar to those of Uganda (Pillay, 2010)). The participation rates in East Africa are much lower than the world average of 26%. According to the State of Education in Africa Report (The Africa-America Institute, 2015), returns to investments in higher education in Africa are 21%, the highest in the world. However, the enrolment rates at universities in Sub-Saharan Africa are among the lowest in the world. In the same Report, it is also noted that African countries have allocated, on average, 18.4% of government expenditure to education, with Uganda’s current allocation at 10% (Financial Year 2016/17) down from 16.2% (Financial Year 2009/2010). The proportion of this budget allocated to higher education is about 12% against the recommended 20%.

When the Committee interacted with the Visitor on this matter, he was of the view that sustainable support of education was only possible when the whole economy was growing.
He argued that for the economy to grow there must be basic essential infrastructure such as good roads and railways as well as utilities like electricity, water, telecommunications and security. These elements that propel the economy must be prioritised so as to stimulate the economy and then enhance revenue collection leading to increased expenditure on education and health services.

The raising of Uganda’s participation to the global average of 26% means trebling the current enrolment, by for instance, enrolling more than 300,000 students annually. However, the high school system does not graduate enough students to join tertiary institutions. According to Uganda’s Statistical Abstract (Republic of Uganda, 2015), 81,412 students were enrolled in Senior Six in 2014. In the same year 327,016 students were in Senior Two who, with maximum support, would provide the best hope of raising the 300,000 thresholds in 2018. In Africa, countries like Egypt (at 30%) and Mauritius (at 41%) have raised these thresholds.

1.5 MAKERERE UNIVERSITY HISTORY, FACTS AND FIGURES

Makerere University began as a humble technical colonial institute in 1922, in temporary buildings, with 14 Students as day boys and four instructors as Academic Staff. The Institute was established to meet the high demand for native artisans in the East African territories of Uganda, Kenya, and Tanganyika; and beyond. Makerere quickly gained a reputation in the territories for producing quality artisans, school teachers, and medical, veterinary and agricultural officers; as well as other administrative support staff for the colonial administration of these territories.

Over the years, Makerere became a College of the University of London, a College of the University of East Africa, and in 1970 it became an independent national University through an Act of Parliament. Makerere University was established as a national and regional symbol of a traditional African University with the main objective of human resource capacity development for the newly independent countries of East African. The University trained the leaders in all fields who ably took over the administration of their countries at independence and beyond. Makerere achieved world class status along the way, especially through ground-breaking research carried out in the Medical School. Unfortunately, the upheavals that bedeviled Uganda for over two decades in the 1970s and 1980s did not spare Makerere. The economic collapse and the civil wars resulted in the deterioration of learning and teaching conditions and a massive brain drain to other countries.

With liberalisation of higher education, the late 1990s accelerated the growth of universities in Uganda. To date, the number of new universities in the country has increased from one (Makerere) to five (5) fully operational public universities and two (2) in the pipeline. There are over 20 private universities.

In 2011, Makerere University adopted the Collegiate System and by 2016, 10 Colleges had been established though not fully operationalised. In addition, the University has 18 affiliated institutions. The liberalisation of higher education and other transformations set in new dynamics at Uganda’s oldest and largest University, with far reaching implications on the socio-economic development and policy development of the Country. As of November, 2016 as per the records from the Planning and Development Department of the University, Makerere University has a population of approximately 37,000 students and 1,425 academic staff. The University which had 14 students in 1922 has grown from an average of 3,700 students in the 1970s, 4,700 students in the 1980s, 10,000 students in the 1990s to more than 30,000 students in the 2010s. The current student population is more than ten times its value in the 1970s. The percentage of female students in the student population is 44% and has been like this for the past eight years. The University shares approximately 21% of Uganda’s
University student population and 42% of the student population in the public university system in Uganda.

The University is organised into 10 Colleges with a total of 33 Schools under which there is a total of 112 departments. The College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHUSS) has the majority of the Students (8,435 representing 23%) while the College of Veterinary, Animal Sciences and Biosecurity (COVAB) has the least number of Students (925 representing 3%). The University has graduated more than 200,000 Students since its establishment with about 180,000 (90%) graduates between 2000 and 2017. Approximately 15,000 graduands were awarded various qualifications in 2017. The percentage of graduate Students is about 7% of the Student population.

The College of Health Sciences (CHS) had the majority of Academic Staff (295 representing 21%) as of November 2016 whereas the School of Law had the least staff (41 representing 3%). The matchup between Staff and Students as measured by the Staff to Student ratios was most favourable in the CHS at 1:7 and least favourable in the College of Education and External Studies (CEES) at 1:71.

At the University level, the Staff to Student average ratio was 1:27, which is considered high compared to the top Universities around the world (University of Cape Town 1:20, Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1:9, Cambridge 1:10). Amongst Academic Staff, the percentage of females was 27% (395) of the 1461 Academic Staff. The University had 96 Professors (8 females) representing 7% of the University Staff. The number of Professors almost doubled from 53 in 2008 to 96 in 2016, while that of Teaching Assistants reduced to 10%, from 246 to 29 Teaching Assistants in the same period. This is indicative of improved career progression over the period of the current University Strategic Plan (2008/09-2018/19) as well as improved Staff development policies. About 660 Academic Staff had PhDs by November 2016 representing 72% of all Academic Staff (at the rank of lecturer and above).

The University curriculum comprises Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) as well as Arts, Humanities, Business and Social Sciences as two broad categories. The population of students in STEM programmes is about 35% which is fairly close to the recommended 40% favorable for economic takeoff. The curriculum is in ten broad areas with Students distributed as indicated in parenthesis: Social and Behavioral Sciences (30%), Business (16%), Physical Sciences and Mathematics (12%), Education (12%), Arts and Humanities (7%), Engineering (6%), Medicine and Health Sciences (6%), Law (4%), and Architecture (1%).

From its inception to around 1990, the University was solely funded by Government for its development and recurrent budget. Major changes occurred to this model of funding with the liberalisation of higher education and allowing in fee-paying students. The population of privately sponsored Students grew from 150 (3% of the enrolment) in 1991/92 to more than 33,000 (83%) in 2016. The contribution to the recurrent budget of the private student tuition is more than 50%. The University has three main sources of finances for its operational costs: Government subvention (45%), Private tuition (50%) and Donor Support (5%).

The University research output as documented in international research citation databases has reached about 1,000 cited publications per year (as extracted from the Scopus Citation Index). From the sources in the citation index, the majority of the cited publications (about 43%) where from the College of Health Sciences. A key source of finances for the University is Grants. In addition to being a source of income, Grants measure the rate at which research outputs generated by the University are being utilised to solve societal problems. In addition, Grants support further research and capacity building at the University. However, due to
inadequate policies and structures in place, this source of finances is not well managed at the University. Attendant information on Grants is scanty and fragmented. This key source is a good potential for supporting the research infrastructure of the University.

Makerere University has undertaken world class leadership in Research and Development (R&D) in the Health Sciences, Agriculture and value-addition, Veterinary and Engineering Sciences and Technology, just to name a few. As a result, it has consistently maintained a high ranking among the top 10 African Universities in the recent past. Nevertheless, Makerere University’s resurgence and explosive growth have come with challenges. Infrastructure and staff numbers have not kept pace with student population increase. Financing arrangements have not been optimal and governance challenges have further complicated the situation. The other relevant statistics are as follows:

**Table 1.5: Summary of Makerere University Key Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Establishment and Student Enrolment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Academic Staff</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Administrative Staff</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Support Staff</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>~37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Staff : Student ratio</td>
<td>1:27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Academic Programmes and Courses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomas</td>
<td>&gt; 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degrees</td>
<td>&gt; 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degrees</td>
<td>&gt; 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhDs</td>
<td>&gt; 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Taught per Semester</td>
<td>&gt; 5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage and Distribution of Programmes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine &amp; Health Sciences (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences (includes Agriculture) (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences (14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (12%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Makerere University Ranking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank in East Africa (Times Higher Education World Rankings 2016/17)</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in Africa (Times Higher Education World Rankings 2016/17)</td>
<td>No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Ranking (Times Higher Education World Rankings 2016/17)</td>
<td>Top 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Self-Assessment Report 2016, Directorate of Quality Assurance

Makerere University undertook major reforms between 2009 and 2011 in its Administrative, Finance and Research Processes. The Committee that handled the reform process was known as the University Research, Administrative, and Financial Reforms Committee (URAFR). The Committee reviewed over 40 key processes in the University spanning across the mandate of the University focusing on Teaching & Learning, Research & Innovations, and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships & Networking. The Reforms Committee produced a Report, the University Organisational Manual, as well as the Research Manual. Subsequent work done by a successor committee, the Change Management Committee, saw the production of more institutional manuals: the Financial Procedures Manual, the Procurement Manual and the Audit Manual. The Makerere University Administrative, Finance and Research review and proposed reforms greatly informed the establishment of the 10 Constituent Colleges and the process of operationalisation of the collegiate system at Makerere University.
The McGregor Visitation Committee to Public Universities (2007) recommended the review of the structures for Administrative Units at Makerere University; this was also raised by the Omaswa Taskforce (2014). It is imperative to note that by the time of the visitation, the restructuring of Administrative Units at Makerere University was not yet complete and the process seemed to have stalled. The previous Committees including but not limited to McGregor, Omaswa, URAFR, the NCHE Review of UOTIA, 2001 as amended, all pointed to the gaps in the Higher Education legal and regulatory framework with attendant issues ranging from: the composition of NCHE, University Council and Senate, the ambiguity in reporting structures amongst the officers of the University, the selection process for University executives, several typos in the Principal Act (UOTIA, 2001 as amended), amongst others. The obtaining recommendations have all pointed to amendment of UOTIA 2001 as amended, with several proposals which have been reviewed by the Visitation Committee on Makerere University, 2016.

1.6 STRIKES AT MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

Strikes at Makerere University have been connected to three types of activism involving academic and administrative/support staff on one hand and students on the other. The strikes have been connected, i.e. "welfare-related and remuneration," ideological activism, and "survival." Both Staff and Students have engaged in numerous strikes while advocating for improved welfare, ideological expression of opinions and some strikes have generally been connected to the desire to survive the changing contexts of the times. A brief history of strikes and their causes in Makerere is presented below:

(1) Strikes at Makerere date before independence. The first significant protest was held in 1952. This strike involved a boycott of the dining halls in a demand for better food. The cause was student "welfare".

(2) During independence, the strikes tended to be ideological. Ideologically-inspired protests in the 1960s became a common feature as students demonstrated against American bombing in northwestern Uganda (a spill-over from conflict in Congo) and the hanging of three African nationalists by the Smith Government in Rhodesia.

(3) A decade later (1976), students plotted, bravely but unsuccessfully, to overthrow the Amin government. This was connected to the ideological orientation that a change of government would possibly come alongside a change of policies and better welfare.

(4) In December 1990, the Student Guild president (Norbert Mao) spearheaded a rejection of a Guild constitution imposed by the Ministry of Education. Even as he put forward a host of economic "survival" issues--the abolition of allowances for books, transportation, and stationery--Mao connected the protests with the government's costly pursuit of war in the north and its tolerance of corruption.

(5) In 1991, there was another strike caused by welfare and survival reasons. The Government had just scrapped student allowances yet students expected Government to give them free housing, food, stationery, and even pocket money and transport back home.

(6) In May 2005, there was a student demonstration which was caused by administrative challenges which students connected to their welfare. A placard reading: "Ssebuwufu was much better-We want him back", signified the indirect demand of better welfare. This strike was caused by apparent weaknesses in University Management systems which did not prioritise student issues as compared to what the Ssebuwufu administration had applied.
(7) In November 2006, there was a strike by staff demanding Government to honor a pledge it had made in April 2004 for a salary increase. The cause of this strike was purely related to Staff welfare.

(8) A year later, in November 2007, the University was shut down for up to two months as lecturers laid down their tools and students turned rowdy over failure to study.

(9) In February 2008, Makerere University Students slipped out of a planned strike that was intended to be staged due to continued redundancy, following a strike by Academic Staff. The Students had for one week remained redundant, after their Lecturers went on strike protesting against the lack of adequate teaching materials. Students tried to seek out a peaceful solution to the stalemate between the Lecturers and the Government and resolved to give the conflicting parties a chance to iron out the problem amicably without resorting to violence.

(10) In September 2011, Makerere University was closed hardly two weeks into the new semester when authorities running the country’s oldest University failed to break a deadlock over a strike by Academic Staff who were demanding enhanced pay and clearance of their pension arrears. Fear of a threat by Students to join the weeklong Lecturers’ strike prompted the sudden closure and saw the University campus, from the gate through to the halls of residence, turned into a mini garrison with hundreds of heavily armed police. Lecturers also demanded that top up allowances that University administrators got be scrapped and that Government takes full responsibility of the payroll instead of the now shared salary payment between the University and Ministry of Public Service.

(11) In 2013, there was a strike by Makerere University Staff demanding for a salary increment from Government. Government then made it clear that it did not have the funds. Government then directed the University Council to consider using internally generated funds to provide an incentive to Staff so that they could call off the strike.

(12) In July 2014- there was a morning strike staged by Students over Management’s decision to scrap meals in the halls of residence and the 10 per cent tuition increment policy for the new students. Makerere University Council had scrapped free meals to all students due to the high food prices and the financial squeeze at Uganda’s biggest University. The Council, the Institution’s top governing body, resolved that every student on the Government scholarship scheme should instead be given a daily meal allowance of UGX 2,000.

(13) In October 2014, Makerere University students went on strike protesting a hike in graduation fees. This strike was again both a survival and welfare issue. The lack of effective consultation by University Management and Council before it was passed appears to have been interpreted by students as being intended to affect their welfare at the University.

(14) In April 2016- Students protested the Institution’s decision to scrap 32 courses. The Report had recommended that 30 degree programmes be merged, 18 be restructured while 21 undergraduate diplomas, 11 undergraduate certificates and three degree programmes be phased out.

(15) Beginning on 1st August 2016, the Non-teaching Staff went on strike demanding their back pay. The strike lasted three weeks and the Government agreed to pay them by the end of October 2016; however, the Government failed to do so.
In November 2016 President Museveni ordered the closure of Makerere due to staff
and later Student strikes over unpaid arrears and lack of lectures respectively.

While the strikes by Students have been mainly connected to survival, welfare and ideology,
almost all strikes by the staff of Makerere University have been connected to welfare,
particularly seeking higher remuneration.

1.7 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The frequent Staff and Student unrest has lately engulfed Makerere University, a Centre of
Excellence on the African Continent, in stark contrast to other public universities in the
country which seem peaceful. As a result, Government temporarily closed the University in
public interest. Efforts to mitigate the recent strike ended in an unfortunate stalemate over the
Staff strike against demand for payment of arrears of their incentive allowance. The latter
sparked off a corresponding but wild protest from the Students, this on the backdrop of an
earlier protest by the Students over food issues and another strike by Non-teaching Staff over
salary enhancement.

The sequential visitations and subsequent recommendations including those: from the
Government White Paper on the Report of the Visitation Committee to Public Universities in
Uganda, 2008, the McGregor Visitation Committee Report of 2007, the Omaswa Report of
2014 and the Kabaasa Reports seem not to have addressed the root causes of the challenges.
Indeed, it would appear, from the preliminary consultations that this Committee has
undertaken in this short while, that the ad hoc changes/arrangements in the sharing of the
proceeds from private Students as per the Kabaasa Reports coupled with failure to regulate
fees in tandem with market price for University education have caused systems in Makerere
University to become mal-functional, given the additional possible financial mismanagement.

Indeed, the main purpose of a public university being the pursuit of scholarship, teaching and
research as well as community involvement, the University must be buttressed by functional
institutional dimensions of a sound governance structure, academic and physical
infrastructure, staffs and students’ welfare amenities. These tend to affect the Institution’s
members diversely and systemically under whatever prevailing mode of management. Therefore,
the increasing propensity of Staff going on strike with a concomitant Student
dissension to escalate into demonstration causes immense socio-economic disruptions in
Government programmes besides causing public anxiety among many key Stakeholders
including Sponsors and the Taxpayers that bankroll Students’ education. It is evident that the
intermittent Staff and Student unrest emanates from Governance/structural shortfalls and
inefficiencies, Student consciousness and external factors which demand insightful
assessment and evaluation. It is against this background therefore that the Visitor found it
prudent to set up the Visitation Committee on Makerere University to examine the root
causes of these strikes and to come up with workable solutions to the challenges.

1.8 TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE VISITATION COMMITTEE

The Committee had the following Terms of Reference (ToR):

(1) To visit, Study and Make a Situation analysis of Makerere University and causes of
endemic strikes including but not limited to academic affairs, financial affairs,
governance affairs, and student affairs, and make recommendations.

(2) To report on the Progress so far made in the implementation of the recommendations
Universities in Uganda, 2008.
(3) To study the three earlier Reports: the McGregor Visitation Committee, Omaswa, and Kabaasa Reports, and make actionable recommendations.

(4) To conduct a Special Audit in Financial Management Practices of Makerere University and if necessary conduct a Forensic Audit.

(5) To conduct an Audit in the population of students, teaching and non-teaching staff presently studying or working at Makerere in order to rule out “ghosts”.

1.8.1 Goal of the Committee

The Committee undertook to establish the root cause of endemic strikes at Makerere University through a thorough critic of the obtaining policy frameworks, governance and management structures and their subsequent impact on Staff and Student welfare and ultimate University environmental harmony, safety and security.

1.8.2 Specific Objectives

Specifically, the Committee:

(1) Examined the effectiveness of the Makerere University legal and structural frameworks for the efficient execution of her mandate in a way that secures timely and relevant policy formulation, and informed management decisions concerning students, staff, and other stakeholders including Government.

(2) Carried out a Special audit of the University to provide assurance as to whether the University properly manages its financial resources; and authenticate the Students and Staff numbers.

(3) Assessed the state and relevance of teaching & learning, research & innovation and knowledge transfer partnerships & networking in order to inform policy on best practice in the management of the core functions of Makerere University.

(4) Established the genesis of Staff and Student discontent that has culminated into the recurrent strikes at Makerere University with a view to informing strategic policy changes for successful public institution management.

(5) Benchmarked Universities of undisputed repute and distinction within their context both on the local, regional and international land scape for best practices.

(6) Made actionable recommendations to be realised in the short, medium and long term with the view of positioning Makerere University as a world class University.

1.9 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The Report is structured around nine (9) chapters. In chapter one the Committee presents an introduction and contextual overview of the assignment. Chapter two focuses on the methodology adopted by the Committee to realise the assignment. Chapters three to eight cover the findings and recommendations on governance and management; academic affairs; student affairs; financial management and utilisation of IT at Makerere University. In chapter nine the Committee presents an action plan for the implementation of the recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.1 APPROACH

The Visitation Committee broadly used a participatory consultative approach to execute its mandate. Within this broad approach, specific approaches were used which involved consulting various stakeholders and secondary sources, conceptualising the collected views on each of the issues contained in the terms of reference, Committee discussion of the emerging findings, synthesising and validating the various information sources and proposing recommended actions. This process is illustrated in the figure below.

Figure 2.1 (a): Summary of approach used to execute the Assignment

Four main approaches or models of analysis were used in executing the assignment. These included the stakeholder mapping, SWOT, CIPP model, and 7S Framework. Each of these was applied in the assessment at different stages. A brief description of these approaches is provided below:

2.1.1 Stakeholder Mapping

To appreciate the challenges faced by Makerere University and to examine the status of implementation of previous recommendations, it was appropriate for the Committee to consult different stakeholders. In order to allow this effective consultation process, a stakeholder map of key actors involved in University governance and management was developed. The stakeholder map was based on the following matrix.

The stakeholders were identified based on a grid that has power and interest of the particular stakeholders. 'Interest' was used to measure to what degree the stakeholders were likely to be affected by the activities of the University or policy change, and what degree of interest or concern they had in or about it. 'Power' measures were used to imply the influence the stakeholders had over the University or policy, and to what degree they could help achieve, or block the desired change. Stakeholders with high power, and interests aligned with the University were considered to be the people or organisations who the University needed to fully engage like Students and Staff as well as Government. In trying to create policy change, these people are the targets of any campaign. The Power and Interest Matrix by Gardner et al. (1986) classifies stakeholders as Latents, Promoters, Apathetics and Defenders as illustrated in Figure 2.1(b).
2.1.2 McKinsey 7S Model

The Committee used the 7-S framework (ref. Figure 2.1.2) where from both secondary and primary sources of information collected and synthesised, the University was assessed based on Strategies taken, the Systems in place, the Structures that run the University, the Shared values in existence or expected in the University, the Staff, the Style of management and the Skills. The findings on each of these seven elements are presented in various sections of the subsequent chapters.

Figure 2.1.2: McKinsey 7S Model


At the very top of the 'power' list are the 'decision-makers', who include the University Council, Ministry of Education and Sports officials, the Regulators and other Government ministries, such as Finance, Planning and Economic Development. Beneath these are people whose opinion matters, i.e. the Academic Staff and Administrative Staff associations'. This creates a pyramid sometimes known as an Influence Map.

Stakeholders with high interest but low power need to be kept informed by the University but, if organised, they may form the basis of an interest group or coalition which can lobby for change. Those with high power but low interest should be kept satisfied and ideally brought around as patrons or supporters for the proposed policy change.

Figure 2.1 (b): Gardner Power and Interest Matrix (Source: Gardner et al., 1986)
2.2 METHODS, ACTIVITIES, AND TOOLS

The Committee in line with the prescribe terms of references undertook the following activities:

(1) Administered:
   a) a self-assessment tool to Makerere University Council: 16 out of 24 Council Members responded (67%).
   b) a survey questionnaire to Academic Staff to establish their contribution to the Mission of the University: 1,150 out of ~1,417 responded (81%).
   c) a job satisfaction survey to Non-Teaching Staff: 300 out of 1,747 responded (17%).
   d) a survey questionnaire to Students to establish the causes of discontent and triggers for strikes at Makerere University.

(2) Held consultative meetings and focus group discussions with key internal and external stakeholders.

(3) Carried out a Special Audit and Head Count of Staff and Students.

(4) Toured University facilities at Main Campus, Jinja Offshore Campus, Mulago, Kabanyolo and Buyana.

(5) Visited Universities both within and outside Uganda for best practices benchmarking.

(6) Made a public call, received submissions/memoranda from a wide range of stakeholders.

(7) Hosted a public dialogue on higher education in Uganda.

(8) Examined recommendations of previous Visitation Committees and Taskforces.

(9) Reviewed relevant secondary sources of information.

In all engagements participants were requested to highlight challenges and possible solutions as well as provide any information deemed relevant to the Visitation Committee.

Using the findings, the Committee made a situation analysis of Makerere University around the key areas of Governance and Management, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, ICT, as well as Financial Management and Investment. In undertaking this exercise, the Committee was enjoined to report on the progress so far made in the implementation of the recommendations of the Government White Paper on the Report of the Visitation Committee to Public Universities in Uganda, 2008. The Table 2.2 describes the procedures that were followed by the Visitation Committee.

Table 2.2: Procedure followed by Visitation Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>The appointment of the Visitation Committee was made by the President on 14th November 2016 following the closure of the University on 1st of November 2016 by the Visitor, which action was triggered by the strike of the Makerere University Academic Staff Association (MUASA) members which was later joined by the Students who rioted demanding to be taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Inauguration</td>
<td>The Committee was inaugurated by H.E the President on Thursday 17th November, 2016 at State House, Entebbe in the presence of Hon Janet Museveni, the First Lady and Minister of Education and Sports, Hon John Chrysostom Muyingo, the Minister of State for Higher Education, Mr. Alex Kakooza, the Permanent Secretary, and some of the officials of the Ministry of Education and Sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Meeting</strong></td>
<td>As part of its working methodology and upon inauguration, the Committee held entry meetings with different stakeholders and amongst themselves. The Committee entry meetings were meant to unpack the terms of reference to inform the strategic framework for execution of the designated tasks. The entry meetings with other stakeholders such as University Officials and the Staff from the Ministry of Education and Sports were intended to generate appropriate background information for executing the assignment. The information collected from the entry meetings was also used to generate an Inception Report detailing how the assignment was to be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Mapping and Scope analysis</strong></td>
<td>The Committee conducted a mapping of different stakeholders whose views were necessary. The Committee also conducted a scope analysis of the expected tasks and deliverables. The adopted definition of stakeholders was any public institution, organisation, group of individuals or individuals who were affected or could affect and were able to further or oppose the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee concluded that the primary stakeholders whose key interests were central to the assignment included students and staff of Makerere University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Based on the entry meetings and the preliminary review of documents, the Committee developed an Inception Report which described the detailed methodology of executing the assignment, the listing of key documents that needed to be reviewed, the list of stakeholders that needed to be consulted, the budget, the terms of reference for the working groups as well as the proposed structure of the Report. The Inception Report was presented to the President and among the preliminary recommendations was the opening of the University to facilitate the Committee’s work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituting Working Committees and Technical Teams</strong></td>
<td>The Committee constituted itself into 4 working groups on Governance and Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Finance and Investment. A technical working team of specialised individuals were co-opted to ensure timely completion of the designated assignment and to provide necessary specialised technical advice. The co-opted staff included 2 Ex-Officios from MoFPED &amp; MoES; 9 Professional Experts; 14 Research Assistants; and 20 Audit Assistants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of communication Strategy</strong></td>
<td>The Committee designed a communication strategy to guide its operations. The strategy provided for a mechanism of providing regular briefs and reports to the Visitor through the First Lady and Honourable Minister of Education and Sports. The official communication had to be executed in writing and the official language of communication throughout all the activities of the Committee was English. The schedule for all interviews, consultations, public hearings and focus group discussions were agreed only to be communicated in writing by the Chairperson in advance to enable the participants prepare a written submission. The strategy also entailed ensuring that all recordings were confidential and could not be availed to unauthorised parties and under no circumstances to the Press. The Chairperson reserved the right of sharing any audio or video recording of the Committee after careful consultation with the Committee and First Lady and Honourable Minister of Education and Sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Consultation</strong></td>
<td>As part of the findings gathering process, the Committee engaged different stakeholders using the instruments that were developed. The stakeholders had oral interface with the Committee as well as making written submissions of their responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Memorandum</strong></td>
<td>The Committee received 16 public memoranda on key issues ranging from governance of the University, financing modalities, student and staff affairs management. The memorandum also contained proposals on what needed to be done by Government and other stakeholders to avert the persistent Student and Staff strikes from happening at Makerere University as well as other public universities in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary document</strong></td>
<td>The ToRs required the Visitation Committee to interface with past government...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review

endeavours to address the daunting problems of Makerere and other public universities culminating in recommendations in recent reports (McGregor; Government White Paper; Kabaasa; Omaswa) which variously inform the review work. Accordingly, from the desk research, the Visitation Committee pronounced itself severally in this Report to relate the pertinent aspects in each report to the work of its Working Groups. A salient assessment area is the extent to which the recommended actions in these documents have been implemented and their subsequent impact. There were other documents that were reviewed to provide useful information. The Bibliography is attached at the end of this Report.

Student Engagement

Unlike previous Visitation Committees which had largely negated the views of Students, the current Visitation Committee put a lot of emphasis on the management of student affairs at Makerere University main campus and for comprehensive purposes reviewed the Jinja up country campus. A Student-Committee engagement session was held with Student leaders and other Students. The Students also submitted their concerns and issues in writing which were synthesised by the Committee.

Staff and student Audit

The Committee conducted a Staff and Student audit at Makerere University. Using a team of research and audit assistants, the two audits were aimed at generating the current status of Staff and Students at the University owing especially to the contradictory official information especially regarding the Student numbers at the University. The Staff audit also contained an efficiency and productivity audit especially of the academic staff.

Financial Audit

The Committee undertook a Special Audit in the Financial Management Practices of the University with particular focus on ascertaining the extent to which those practices were aligned to the Strategic Plan, and how they drove the University business. The audit was used to establish the completeness of revenues both received and receivable over the years and their adequacy or inadequacy in meeting the University’s expenditures and immediate needs, and the longer-term infrastructure and investment financial horizon. The Committee used the audit to ascertain accountability and assurance of expenditures being applied for their intended purposes.

Data analysis

The data collected from various sources was analysed using different approaches. Qualitative data was analysed around the key themes of governance, staff affairs, student affairs, teaching and learning processes as well as financial management practices. The quantitative data was analysed using basic statistical analyses like percentages and frequencies and trend analysis was conducted for financial information.

Benchmarking studies

The Committee conducted benchmarking visits at other Universities in Uganda and abroad for validation of its recommendations and those of previous Committees. It was important that the Committee visited some of the universities visited by the Omaswa and McGregor Committees to understudy their findings.

Draft Report

The technical specialist developed a proposed structure of the Report which was presented to the Committee for adoption. Upon this adoption, the Committee developed a Draft Interim Report which was presented to the Appointing Authority.

Report Validation

The Committee presented the draft report before a number of stakeholders for validation. The stakeholders were met in groups and a step-wise approach was used. The University Council was the last organ of the University to validate the findings.

Final Report

The Committee went into working sessions to finalise the Report based on inputs from the validation exercise. The Committee finalised its recommendations, subjected the Report to editing and formatting before being submitted formally to the Appointing Authority through the agreed upon channels of communication.

Exit Meeting

The Committee held exit meetings with Makerere University Chancellor, the University Council and Senior Management Team as well as with the Minister of Education and Sports. The purpose of these meetings was to share the lessons and best practices and map out a strategy for implementation of the recommendations by different stakeholders.

### 2.3 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The key methods and tools for undertaking this assignment included Desk Research.
Visit and observations, Benchmarking with Prevailing Best Practices; Stakeholder Surveys; and Public Contributions (Written and Oral).

The data collection methods included questionnaire surveys, interviews, focus group discussions, public hearings, public written submissions, visits and tours of University facilities, observations in real time of key activities of interest, benchmarking, as well as review of information in secondary sources.

2.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS

The analysis of the data was done using both qualitative and quantitative means. The descriptive statistical analysis techniques were used to analyse quantitative survey data obtained from Council Members, Staff and Students. Financial data was analysed using trend analysis to enable the Committee identify the trends of University financing. Risk mapping was used to analyse the financial information obtained from a special audit of the University finances.

2.5 VALIDATION OF FINDINGS

The Committee organised stakeholder sessions with the members of the University Council, Members of Senior Management, representatives of the Academic Staff as well as Student and other stakeholder representatives to validate the findings.
CHAPTER THREE: GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 Context and Key Definitions

The Committee drew a major distinction between higher education governance and management. To this end, the following definitions were adopted from the Eurydice Report (2008) on Higher Education Governance in Europe: Policies, Structures, Funding and Academic Staff:

**Higher Education Governance:** Governance generally focuses on the rules and mechanisms by which various stakeholders influence decisions, how they are held accountable, and to whom. In the context of higher education, governance refers to the formal and informal exercise of authority under laws, policies and rules that articulate the rights and responsibilities of various actors, including the rules by which they interact. In other words, higher education institution governance encompasses the framework in which an institution pursues its goals, objectives and policies in a coherent and coordinated manner to answer the questions: ‘Who is in charge?, and what are the sources of legitimacy for executive decision-making by different actors?’

**Higher Education Management:** is the implementation of a set of objectives pursued by a higher education institution on the basis of established rules. It answers the question ‘how are the rules applied’ and is concerned with the efficiency, effectiveness and quality of services provided to internal and external stakeholders.

The Committee undertook the assignment in cognizance that, despite the distinction between governance (with its emphasis on the process of setting policies and long-term goals as well as the strategies for reaching these goals) and Management (which is action-oriented), the various links between the two cannot be overlooked.

**External Stakeholders:** persons who have a vested interest in the function, practices, and outcomes of higher education institutions (may include members of central, regional or local government, employers in the labor market or other representatives from industry, members of labor unions, national student associations, representatives of civic society, graduates, parents of students, etc.).

**Internal Stakeholders:** institutional governance bodies (e.g. Advisory Boards, Council, Academic Senate, etc.) and persons employed by or enrolled at a higher education institution.

**Independence of a Member or Governance Body:** The King IV Report on Corporate Governance for South Africa (Institute of Directors, 2016: 13), puts forward the following definition:

*Independence generally means the exercise of objective, unfettered judgment. When used as the measure by which to judge the appearance of independence, or to categorize a non-executive member of the governing body or its committees as independent, it means the absence of an interest, position, association or relationship which, when judged from the perspective of a reasonable and informed third party, is likely to influence unduly or cause bias in decision-making.*
3.1.2 University Governance Models

There are various higher education governance models of which six are presented below. This is an extract from the College Formation Analysis Report submitted by Makerere University to the National Council for Higher Education.

(1) **Bureaucratic Model (“Old School”):** As might be anticipated, the bureaucratic model of governance derives its strength from the writings of Max Weber who advocated that decision making and planning are the exclusive preserve of the few individuals in the top rung of the hierarchy ladder. Such decisions and plans are implemented through a coordinated division of labour, standardisation of rules and regulations, and a hierarchical chain of command (Weber, 1948; Baldridge, 1971; Hardy, 1990). However, bureaucracies in academe are thought to function in a different manner from traditional bureaucracies found in the corporate world, the private sector, or for that matter, in ecclesiastical settings, because power is decentralised to units such as departments. Academic staff members constitute a specialised cadre which understands its obligations to the organisation, thereby obviating the need for a steep chain of command (Tierney, 2004).

(2) **The Collegial Model:** In this model, there is an assumption that a community of scholars operates around the notions of respect and consensus. Proponents of the collegial perspective are convinced that decisions made are honoured in deference to the professional and intellectual competence and authority of the makers, and not through politics, rules and other persuasions (Hamilton, 1997). The collegium is made up of loosely connected individuals embedded in a decentralised edifice. Millet (1962), who is one of the earliest advocates of such a framework, summarised cogently the position of the academy when he stated “I do not believe that a structure of a hierarchy is a desirable prescription for the organisation of a college….The concept of community presupposes an organisation in which functions are differentiated through a dynamic consensus”. The collegial model is characteristic of old universities in the UK, e.g. Oxford, Cambridge and a few Scottish universities. In the United States, older universities such as Harvard and Yale which were founded on the Oxbridge model retained such a framework for many decades until a typical American style of university management evolved. The dominant American model is one in which the board of trustees, a self-perpetuating organisation, holds the ultimate power in universities and colleges, both public and private (Shattock, 2006). Students of history, undoubtedly, can trace the origins of the collegial model back to the 12th and 13th century when in Paris, the University was conceived to be constituted by the faculty who organised schools, offering professional training. In marked contrast over the same period, Bologna was organised differently in that students were considered to constitute the university. The leaders and owners of the university hired instructors to teach pre-selected curricula and instructors had no rights or tenure and thus could be fired at the whims of management.

(3) **The Political Model:** The political model arose from the circumstances of the 1960s and 1970s during which students in both continental Europe and North America demanded for a greater say in the governance of their respective universities. Collective bargaining, conflicts, give and take comprised the dominant features of the period. The resolution of such conflicting interests and demands took on a political character rather than the traditional processes and consensus building. Baldridge (1971) outlined the tenets of the political governance by showing that universities are complex microcosms of the larger society with conflicts and intrigues. There exists
within universities power and pressure groups that influence decision-making. When sufficient momentum is reached, such pressures are translated into policy and during the implementation phase of the policy, feedback is generated that may become the source of new conflicts.

The problem inherent in the political model, it would appear, lies in the fact that it incorporates under its rubric all other models of governance, i.e. the bureaucratic, collegial and related models become encapsulated in the political model (Hardy, 1990).

(4) **The Cybernetic Model**: Robert Birnbaum (1988) is the champion of the cybernetic model which has dominated the theoretical landscape over the last two decades. No better words can describe the theory than to quote from the source. "The cybernetic paradigm integrates existing models by suggesting how bureaucratic, collegial, political, and anarchical subsystems function simultaneously in colleges and universities of all kinds to create self-correcting institutions. The cybernetic paradigm posits that organisation control systems can be described in terms of sensing mechanisms and negative feedback loops that collectively monitor changes from acceptable levels of functioning and that activate forces that return institutions to their previous stable state. These self-correction (cybernetic) processes function as institutional "thermostats" (1989, p. 239).

The cybernetic model has attracted a number of criticisms, not the least of which is its limited scope in terms of practical application. It is hard to imagine how an institution can set up sensitive sensing mechanisms in its governance structure, some of which involves handling by capricious human beings. It is even harder to imagine how structures involving human beings can be put in place to serve as negative or forward feedbacks. As pointed out earlier in this Report, human beings do not behave as rational machines (Salzenick, 1947; Simon, 1958; Sandgren and Stromqvist, 2006). Another criticism against the cybernetic model is that it may work well for an organisation that is well grounded and stable. In a dynamic environment where changes are brought about by rapid advances in technology, and where new learning curves emerge, the cybernetic model will not have sufficient speed and power to bring back the entire system into equilibrium (Christensen, 1997; Frank and Cook, 1996).

(5) **The Corporate or Managerial Model**: The managerial model emerged in the past two decades from management science, particularly in connection with the notion of strategic policy making (Dill and Helm, 1988). Corporate governance emphasises managerialism, i.e., increasing reliance on market as mechanism for decision making, (Bahinder, 1993; Bertelsen, 2002; Fulton, 2003) and its preoccupation with efficiency and effectiveness as distinct measures of good management. A corporate model of governance in a university setting is easily discernible because managers of institutions are prevailed upon to adopt the tools of new public management such as mission statements, performance indicators, quality assurance or outcome-based evaluation process, and an obsession with continuous improvements (Meek and Hayden, 2005). The outcry for public management, per se, is fueled by neo-liberalism as a dominant ideology in economic development policy. One of the main characters of corporate governance is the use of an institution’s governing body whose members are largely non-academic, particularly those with credentials from the commercial and financial circles to control the key affairs of the institution.
Historically, the corporate model of university governance (because of its origins in neo-liberal policies) has been associated on a global scale with a number of manifestations including:

- **a)** Cost sharing in higher education;
- **b)** A high expectation on the part of government and the public that universities will be accountable for the expenditure of public funds;
- **c)** An increased tendency for the government to provide funds that are tied to specific priorities or are intended to support certain socio-economic activities of special interest to government;
- **d)** Increased pressure on universities to adopt an entrepreneurial culture to generate more revenues (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Meek, 2000; Sandgren and Stromqvist, 2006); and
- **e)** Pre-occupation of the state with eliminating all forms of collective bargaining by labour unions representing university employees.

There is a wide acceptance of the corporate model of governance in higher education institutions globally and the trend is towards more acceptance (Gellert, 1993; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Bennett, 2002; Fulton, 2003; Nelson, 2005; Tommaso and Catalano, 2006; Carney, 2006) such that universities like Oxford and Cambridge have been severely criticised by the government and public alike for their reluctance to reform (Oxford, 2005; Shepherd, 2008). Other investigators, on the other hand, are clamouring for a hybrid of the collegial and managerial systems in what has been referred to as shared governance (Quinn and Moore, 1992; Ramo, 1997, 1998; Dearlove, 2002; Shattock, 2002, 2006; Coldrake et al., 2003; Fulton, 2003; Lapworth, 2004; Carney, 2006; Johnson, 2007; McMaster 2007). Tierney (2004) summarised the merit of the hybrid model when he stated:

> The challenge is to create processes and structure of governance that enable academic organisations to create and sustain an experimental environment while at the same time holding onto values (Tierney, 2004, p, 114).

**6) The Governance Equaliser Model:** The governance equaliser model as proposed by Schimank (2005) attempts to integrate all existing models of university governance in European countries. Schimank suggests that there are five mechanisms or modes of university governance regimes and that each mode has the capacity to influence the other mechanisms at any given time. The five mechanisms are:

- **a)** **State Regulation** (SR) in which the state directs universities as regards what needs to be done; essentially this is a prescription mechanism;
- **b)** **Guidance by External Stakeholders** (ES) takes place when advice is given by interested parties outside of academe in order to achieve the institution’s set goals. The external stakeholders may consist of intermediary bodies established by government, parliament, labour unions or industry;
- **c)** **Academic Self-Governance** (ASG) derives authority from the traditional democratic collegial decision making and peer review;
- **d)** **Managerial or Hierarchical Self-Governance** (MSG) consists of formal hierarchical organisation of universities Centreing on the roles and authority of vice chancellors, deputy vice chancellors, deans, directors, etc.; and
- **e)** **Competition** (C) for scarce resources, i.e. money, staff, students within the university and between universities.
As pointed out above, the status and position of each of these mechanisms can influence the rest of the other mechanisms, thereby determining the outcome of the decision-making process or event. Just like in an audio equaliser which enables a person to control or adjust the frequency response (tone) of a sound system, it is possible to manipulate the five mechanisms of governance in a way that gives the optimal performance under given circumstances.

The equaliser model is very close to what is applied at Makerere University. Government enacted the Principal Governance Act (UOTIA 2001, as amended) and empowered the National Council for Higher Education to regulate the Universities with each Public University having a University Council to steer and set the strategic direction of the University; approve policy and planning; provide strategic oversight; and ensures management accountability. The Government subvention is complimented by other sources of funding running the university. The university levies fees to qualifying students beyond those on government scholarship in order to make up for anticipated deficits in the university expenditures; and the university management and individual academic staff appeal/apply directly to development partners for financial support through research and development grants applying management self-governance and academic shared governance models, respectively.

3.1.3 Core Values of Higher Education Governance

The United Kingdom (UK) Higher Education (HE) Governance Code provides that, high-quality higher education which commands public confidence and protects the reputation of the system rests on a number of shared values. It is further asserted that a failure to adopt and implement agreed values in the practice of governance has implications beyond the institution concerned, by potentially undermining the collective reputation of the National Higher Education System. The UK HE Governance Code is based on the expectation that alongside specific measures of the Code, governing bodies will commit to the core values of higher education governance which include:

1. Autonomy as the best guarantee of quality and international reputation.
2. Academic freedom and high-quality research, scholarship and teaching.
3. Protecting the collective student interest through good governance.
4. The publication of accurate and transparent information that is publicly accessible.
5. A recognition that accountability for funding derived directly from stakeholders requires higher education institutions to be clear that they are in a contract with stakeholders who pay for their service and expect clarity about what is received.
6. The achievement of equality of opportunity and diversity throughout the institution.
7. The principle that higher education should be available to all those who are able to benefit from it.
8. Full and transparent accountability for public funding.

3.2 HIGHER EDUCATION STRATEGY, OVERSIGHT STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS IN UGANDA

3.2.1 The Higher Education Strategy

The Uganda Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2003-2015 highlighted improving governance in higher education institutions as one of the six (6) strategic objectives. The following was noted in the Plan; “the success of a higher education institution, or any
institution for that matter, depends on the versatility, creativity, openness and effectiveness of its governance”. The Ministry of Education & Sports (MoES) further highlighted the following governance gaps in the Plan:

(1) Uganda’s higher education institutions are not coordinated to share experiences and maximise the use of the already limited resources pointing out that Uganda’s higher education subsector does not constitute an integrated and cohesive system, as each of the institutions works independently to achieve its mission.

(2) There is neither horizontal nor vertical integration, even amongst institutions of the same category such as universities; as such movement of scholars from one institution to another through the globally classical credit transfer system is not possible in Uganda. This also applies to challenges for scholars seeking higher qualification with certificates and diplomas, a process handled without a clear nationally accredited system for all higher education institutions.

(3) Each public university sets its own programmes without consultation with other similar institutions resulting in unnecessary and wasteful duplication of programmes even in the cases where public universities are within the same city especially Kampala.

Pursuant to the above, the Committee noted that:

(1) The Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 expired and has not been reviewed or replaced with a successor Strategic Plan to inform public policy on higher education. The Education Sector Investment Plan also expired and has not been reviewed.

(2) Public universities are not collectively coordinated to deliver complimentary value to the Nation. The Committee noted that there are challenges related to mobility of scholars, duplication of programs within Makerere University and among public institutions in the same city (COBAMS & MUBS), different qualification standards and remunerations for staff at similar rank within public universities.

3.2.2 The Principal Act – UOTIA, 2001 as amended

The Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act, Act No.7 of 2001, as amended (hereafter referred to as the Act or the Law) establishes the National Council for Higher Education, its functions and administration, administration and standards of universities and other institutions of higher education in Uganda and provides for other related matters.

The objects of the Act, are to establish and develop a system governing institutions of higher education in order to equate qualifications of the same or similar courses offered by different institutions of higher education while at the same time respecting the autonomy and academic freedom of the Institutions; and to widen the accessibility of high quality standard institutions to students wishing to pursue higher education courses by:

(1) regulating and guiding the establishment and management of those institutions;

(2) equating the same professional or other qualifications as well as the award of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other awards by the different institutions.

The Committee noted that:

(1) The Act does not have sufficient and appropriate regulations to guide its operationalisation.

(2) There are lacunas in the Act and typos, leading to interpretation and application challenges. For example, prescription of the lines of authority of key University
executives results into conflicting discharge of powers. The Vice Chancellor not being the Accounting Officer creates a lacuna in management accountability.

(3) The higher education community has severally advanced the need for amendment of Act to eliminate obtaining gaps. The previous Committees including but not limited to McGregor; Omaswa, URAFR, the NCHE Review of the Act, all pointed to the gaps in the higher education legal and regulatory framework with attendant issues ranging from: the composition of NCHE, University Council and Senate, the ambiguity in reporting structures amongst the officers of the University, several typos in the Act, the selection process for University executives, amongst others. The obtaining recommendations have all pointed to amendment of Act, with several proposals which have been reviewed by the Visitation Committee on Makerere University, 2016.

The following are some of the general amendments to the Title and Interpretation section of the Act adopted from the proposals by the NCHE. Other proposals are considered in the respective sections of this Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I – SHORT TITLE, INTERPRETATION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following terms should also be interpreted under this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation - means a regulatory system for recognising higher education institutions and academic and professional programmes associated with those institutions for a level of performance, integrity, appropriate standards and quality which entitle them to the confidence of the education community and the public they serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education - education offered beyond Advanced level of education or its equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License - means a license issued to an institution of higher education after having satisfactorily achieved in no less than five years, as a provisional license holder, the required standard set by the National Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute - means the governing instrument of a University made by a university council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Higher Education – is education received outside Uganda or having affiliation outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Higher Education Provider - Higher education providers coming from outside Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course – is a subject of study with defined learning outcomes, content, and credit units offered within a prescribed period of instruction, assessment and examination typically a semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme – an embodiment of courses with minimum graduation requirements leading to the award: certificate, diploma, or degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 Regulations for Operationalisation of the Principal Act

The National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) is mandated under Section 128 of the Act to make regulations with the approval of the Minister for the better carrying into effect the provisions of the Act, under Section 123(1)) to set institutional standards by way of regulations to govern the performance, operations and general conduct of Universities and Tertiary Institutions and in furtherance of this mandate, to set the basic ethical standards regulating the conduct of all members of the University and any other provision that NCHE may consider necessary for setting a good standard in the Universities.

In exercise of its powers under the Act, NCHE has made the following regulations;
(1) The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Institutional Standards) Regulations, SI No. 85 of 2005. These regulations provide for standards for libraries, curricula and physical facilities for all universities.

(2) The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Quality Assurance) Regulations, SI No 34 of 2008. The purpose of these Regulations is to ensure appropriateness, relevance and adequacy of programmes and courses of study as well as the qualifications of staff and the quality of students of institutions of higher learning in Uganda.

The data available to the Visitation Committee indicates that the challenges at Makerere University transcend the areas that have been covered by the above cited Regulations. Generally, the purpose of Regulations made by issue of a statutory instrument is to operationalise the Act under which they are made. They do not and should not seek to amend the provisions of the particular Act under which they are made.

The Visitation Committee further noted that, whereas the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, 2001 repealed the Makerere University Act, 1970, Under Section 73 of the current Act, the regulations and statutes made under the old Act were saved until they are revoked or replaced by new ones made under the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions. Accordingly, the Makerere University (Senior Administrative Staff) (Specification) Order No. 41 of 1976 is saved by the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act. This particular statutory instrument has however been overtaken by events.

In light of the above, the dearth of Regulations on some pertinent areas under the Act justifies the urgent need for NCHE to exercise its mandate under the law to give effect to the Act.

3.2.3.1 Guidelines for Selection of the Chancellor of a Public University

The Chancellor of a Public University is appointed by the President on the recommendation of the University Council. The Act however does not lay out the salient processes that the University Council undertakes to identify the suitable candidate for onward recommendation to the President for appointment. The Makerere University Council Charter, 2012 does not provide guidance on the matter either.

The same applies to the appointment process of the Vice Chancellors, and the Deputy Vice Chancellors of a Public University. The Act stipulates that the Vice Chancellor is appointed by the Chancellor on the recommendation of the University Council from among three candidates recommended by the Senate. A search committee composed of two members from the University Council and three members from the University Senate identifies suitable candidates for the post of Vice Chancellor and forwards them to the Senate to nominate three candidates for recommendation to the University Council. There are no guidelines in place to facilitate the search committee in identifying the suitable candidates for the post of Vice Chancellor of a Public University.

The Committee examined the best practices on this matter in other countries. The University Act of Tanzania for example stipulates that in making appointments to key administrative positions in a university, the appointing authorities should ensure that such appointments are made on merit; in accordance with an open system capable of inspiring confidence and fairness, the respective appointees’ competence for the relevant positions and their general acceptability in the institutions in question, have all been taken into account. The key administrative positions referred to in the Tanzanian Act include the Vice Chancellor and Deputy Vice Chancellors. The Act further provides that the Council or, as the case may be, the Governing Board shall, by its enabling legal instrument or by regulations, prescribe the attributes of the open system, which attributes shall include the form, way or method of
identifying candidates, participation of the community or the organs of governance of the institution that shall be involved in the process of such system.

According to the Charter of the University of Southern Queensland, where a vacancy occurs, or is expected to occur in the office of the Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor’s Committee will recommend for Council’s approval, a position description and a method of recruitment for the position including the constitution of any shortlisting panel and selection committee. Upon approval, the short-listing panel will undertake a search for a person to fill the position of Vice Chancellor. An external recruitment company may be retained to assist in this process. The selection committee will be constituted of no more than seven (7) members and must include the Chancellor, the Deputy Chancellor and the Chair of Academic Board. The selection committee will normally include appropriately qualified external co-opted members and will contain an appropriate gender mix. The majority of members of the selection committee must be external independent members of Council.

The Deputy Vice Chancellors are appointed by the Chancellor on the recommendation of the University Senate with the approval of the University Council. There are no regulations in place to guide the Senate in the recruitment process of the Deputy Vice Chancellors of a Public University.

### 3.2.3.2 The Basic Ethical Standards for Members of a Public University

The Uganda NCHE is mandated by law to set the basic ethical standards regulating the conduct of all members of the University. The members of the University under the Act include the Chancellor, Chairperson of the University Council, members of the University Council, Vice-Chancellor, the Deputy Vice-Chancellors, members of the University Senate, Professors and Lecturers of the Public University, University Secretary, Librarian and Bursar, Academic Registrar of the University, Dean of Students, Students of the University, members of the Convocation; and such other members of the Staff of the University or of anybody formally admitted into association with the University as the University Council may, from time to time determine.

The University Council is mandated to provide for the welfare and discipline of Students in the university. In exercise of this mandate, the University Council has developed the Makerere University Students Regulations SI No.37/2015. These Regulations provide for actions constituting misconduct and the disciplinary procedures applicable to Students of Makerere University. With regard to the Staff of the University, the University Human Resources Manual of October, 2009 provides for the general code of behavior of university employees breach of which calls for disciplinary action. The Manual also details circumstances that amount to misconduct by a university employee and the applicable disciplinary measures. This however does not apply to University Council Members as some of them are not employees of the University per se.

There are no defined procedures for disciplinary action whether individually or for Council as a whole. The Act only makes provision for circumstances under which an office of a council member may fall vacant. This leaves out aspects of course of action in the event of misconduct by council members. However, there is in place the Makerere University Council Charter, 2012 that sets out standards under which Council performs its duties. It *inter alia* sets out duties for council members such as attendance of meetings, compliance with laws, policies and procedures, upholding confidentiality of council matters, participating in Council’s self-evaluation process and evaluation of senior members of management. The Charter conspicuously leaves out detailed circumstances that constitute misconduct by a Council member and the resultant action on such a member.
The danger of having no clear consequences of noncompliance to laws, policies and procedures or any other misconduct may breed impunity and other forms of misconduct. There is need therefore for NCHE to put in place a code of conduct for Council Members and Staff of public universities with clear disciplinary procedures. With regard to Students, the Student regulations made by the University Council in exercise of its mandate under the Act may suffice.

3.2.3.3 Regulation for Review/Visitations Mechanism by the NCHE

The Act mandates NCHE to monitor, evaluate and regulate institutions of higher learning. The introduction of higher education Councils is seen as indicative of efforts to move from a state control to a state supervision model; in particular, the introduction of agencies with specialised functions and expertise, and a degree of autonomy and political independence. Such effort is envisaged to improve efficiency and effectiveness within the governance system of universities.

Whereas NCHE has come up with the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Institutional Standards) Regulations, 2005 that inter alia provide for evaluation of performance and supervision where all universities and tertiary institutions are supposed to prepare and submit to NCHE Annual Reports of their activities in each year of operation; and once in every three years, a detailed self-evaluation report of the steps it has taken towards the achievement of the aims and objects for which it was established and NCHE to inspect a higher education institution as and when it deems necessary to verify the contents of the evaluation report received in respect of the Institution, the said Regulations do not specify the consequences for noncompliance with these requirements. There is thus a need by NCHE to revise the instrument and specify the penalty for non-compliance but also institute mechanisms to fully operationalising these provisions.

The Committee examined some best practices in other countries. In Kenya’s Higher Education system, the Commission for University Education (Uganda’s equivalent of the NCHE) has the power to deregister an institution, withdraw a programme or prevent graduations in a particular circumstance should prescribed standards not be met by the concerned Institution. In Tanzania, pursuant to the University Act of Tanzania, a higher education institution which fails without reasonable cause to provide professional opinion or information as demanded by the Commission; or knowingly provides wrong, false or invalid opinion or information to the Commission constitutes an offence on the part of the officer in charge of the defaulting institution and is liable to a fine of Tanzanian shillings 1,000,000/=.

There is need for clear Regulations that spell out the consequences of non-compliance with the procedures and standards set by NCHE and these consequences should cut across the entire divide of higher education institutions, whether private or public. Some of the incentives may include an increase in grants to the public universities that are evaluated to be compliant with the procedures and standards set by NCHE.

3.2.3.4 Regulations for Staff and Student Associations

The Law as amended, stipulates that each Public University may have an Academic Staff Association and Administrative Staff Association, a Supporting Staff Association and Student Union also known as the Student Guild.

Makerere University Academic Staff Association: During a consultative meeting between the University Council and the Visitation Committee, the Council members noted that the MUASA Constitution currently in force was approved by MUASA members and adopted at the General Meeting held at Makerere University, Kampala on 29th July, 1975 and was subsequently amended by the Annual General meeting on 5th July, 1989.
According to this Constitution, the objectives of the Makerere University Academic Staff Association include, consideration and promotion of matters of academic interest in the University, joint consultation with other academic bodies on matters of general academic interest, encouraging and maintaining academic and professional cooperation and exchange between members of the Association and members of staff in other Universities and other institutions of higher learning, promotion of productive scholarship and research especially that concerning Uganda and the rest of Africa, the advancement and protection of the occupational interest of members of the Association in relation to their service to the University and upholding and protection of the principle of Democracy as an unalienable right of members of the Association. The Association representatives to Council are selected through elections by simple majority of all members present and voting.

The Association pursuant to its Constitution has the right to at any time recall any representatives of the Association to Council who will not have discharged his/her duties and responsibilities to the satisfaction of the membership. The quorum for the Association meetings is thirty (30) members at a general meeting and five (5) members at the executive meeting. The observation is that this is an archaic Constitution that was put in place under the repealed Makerere University Act, 1970. The Committee was informed that MUASA is in the process of reviewing the Constitution.

**Makerere University Pensioners Association (MUPA):** This Association is established pursuant to the Constitution of Makerere University Pensioners Association (MUPA) whose objectives include regulation, safeguarding and oversight of all matters that pertain to regular payment of members. The Constitution is registered with the Registrar of Documents. It is however not clear as to whether the process of its development involved any University authorities.

**Student Guild and Associations:** Students are the major stakeholders of Makerere University. The Law makes provision for a Students’ Association in each Public University, constituted in accordance with statutes made for that purpose by the University Council. According to the Makerere University Students Regulations SI No.37/2015 developed by Makerere University Council, the Guild Government has the obligation of liaising with the University Administration in promoting and protecting the interests of the University. The formation of Student Associations is provided for under Chapter 12 of the Makerere University Students’ Guild Constitution (as amended in February, 2016). The Constitution grants the right to any member of the Makerere University Student Guild to initiate an organisation with the approval of the Guild Representative Council and the Dean of the Students.

Noteworthy is the fact that the role of the Dean of Students is final assent and recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for a certificate of registration. The Guild Constitution also provides that the aims and objectives of the organisation have to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution, the University Regulations and the laws of the land and also not against morality, public peace and principles of natural justice.

**Best Practices Benchmarking:** With regard to best practices, according to the Tanzanian Universities Act No.7/2005, Staff Association or Students' organisations are prohibited from engaging in any political party's activities on campus. This Act defines "engaging in political party’s activity" to include regular recruitment, training, registering or enrolment of political party members, regular organisation of meetings, seminars and conferences for a political party or political parties, operating a branch office or cell or the like of a political party or political parties and matters of a similar nature.
According to the Obafemi Awolowo University (Nigeria) Ile-Ife Revised Manual of Administrative Procedures of August, 2006, application for recognition of societies and clubs is made through the Vice President of the Students’ Union to the Dean of Students’ Affairs who is the approving authority on behalf of the Vice Chancellor. Under this Manual, the Vice-Chancellor has the prerogative to suspend, dissolve, or prescribe any student society or club whose activities are not consistent with the aims and objectives of the University.

In light of the above, the regulation of the student association according to the Act lies with the University Council which is mandated to come up with statutes for this purpose. It is therefore imperative that the University Council in exercise of its mandate under the Act comes up with statutes specifically providing for the full engagement of the University Administration when approving new Student Associations as opposed to the current negligible role of assenting to the approval of Student Associations and issuing certificates of registration. Such statutes should also clearly prohibit the engagement in political party activities by students during election of Student leaders.

The NCHE should make Regulations to guide the University Council for the approval of the constitutions of Staff and Student Associations in exercise of their mandate. The Regulations could also provide for the need for the Staff Associations to be in line with the current University Laws and Regulations. The University Council should also be granted the powers to take action on associations that divert from the objectives for which they were made to other objectives that disrupt the University programmes.

3.2.3.5 Regulations on Policy Formulation by University Councils

The University Council of a Public University is mandated to formulate the general policy of the Public University. In the meeting held between the Makerere University Visitation Committee and Makerere University Council, the Council informed the Committee that Policy Formulation at the University is guided by the Policy on Policy Development and Review which provides for Stakeholder engagement.

The copy of the Policy on Policy Development and Review that is accessible on the Makerere University Website stipulates that its objective is to establish the University Policy Framework which defines University policy, establishes the range of policy instruments (Policy, Procedure and Guideline), specifies Approval Authorities for all policy instruments, and the Policy development cycle. Noteworthy is the fact that the Policy Development Cycle laid out in this draft Policy includes consultations. It however does not specify which institutions should be consulted and on what subject.

It is crucial that the NCHE comes up with Regulations to guide public Universities regarding the particular stakeholders that should be consulted in the policy making process and on what subject matter. External consultations are relevant because the policies that are made by universities may have legal, financial, human resource among other implications. Whereas proceeding with no external consultation may appear to save time in the short term, it can also result in problems afterwards that may have been avoided. The Regulation should therefore specifically provide that depending on the nature of a particular policy proposed to be developed by a Public University Organ, the offices of the Attorney General, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Ministry of Public Service, Ministry of Education and Sports, National Council for Higher Education to mention but a few should be consulted before approval of policies that have implications to Government beyond Makerere University.
3.2.3.6 Procedure for Making Statutory Instrument

The procedure for making Statutory Instruments is laid out in Section (Q - b), paragraphs 1-9 of the Public Service Standing Orders, 2010. The NCHE is mandated to make regulations with the approval of the Minister for the better carrying into effect the provisions of the Act. The NCHE is therefore the fore driver of the Regulation-making process by virtue of this mandate.

The following stakeholders have important roles in the formulation of Regulations to operationalise the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act.

1. The National Council for Higher Education
2. The Ministry of Education and Sports
3. The Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs specifically the Directorate of the First Parliamentary Counsel.
4. The Ministry of Public Service
5. The Public Universities
6. The Private Universities
7. Uganda Printing and Publishing Company

Following the procedures provided for in the Public Service Standing Orders, before instructions are given to the First Parliamentary Counsel for the drafting of the respective Statutory Instruments, NCHE first seeks the approval of the Minister responsible for Higher Education, in this case the Minister of Education and Sports. When the Minister has approved the proposals for legislation, NCHE then forwards the approval to the First Parliamentary Council together with any other relevant papers to enable the drafts persons understand what the legislation is intended to achieve.

The First Parliamentary Council may call for meetings with the NCHE to obtain all the information that may be required for drafting purposes. The Drafts of the legislation, when ready, are provided to NCHE which is expected to examine them critically and also circulate them to persons, who in the opinion of NCHE should be given an opportunity to comment or persons that may be affected by them. Given the nature of the proposed areas for Regulations, such persons or institutions may include the Public Universities, Private Universities, Ministry responsible for Public Service, among others. After the legislation has been drafted by First Parliamentary Counsel and approved by NCHE, a final copy signed by NCHE is sent to the First Parliamentary Counsel for instructions to Uganda Printing and Publishing Company to publish the Regulations.

3.2.4 The Visitor to Public Universities

Section 26 of the Act, provides for His Excellency the President of the Republic of Uganda to be the Visitor to all Public Universities. The Law further makes the following provisions:

(2) *The Visitor shall, as often as circumstances may require, in respect of any of the affairs of a Public University –*
   a) conduct a visitation of the Public University; or
   b) direct the Chancellor of a Public University that a visitation be conducted by a person or persons that the Visitor may appoint.

(3A) Nothing contained in subsections (1), (2) and (3) shall be construed as preventing the National Council from inspecting and conducting visitations to any Public University.”

(4) *The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of a Public University shall –*
This Visitation Committee noted that the Act, Section 30 (3), provides that, “The Chancellor shall be the titular head of the University and as such shall preside at all ceremonial assemblies of the University and, in the name of that University, confer degrees and other academic titles and distinctions of that University”. With these powers of the Chancellor, the provision of the Act, Section 26 (3) (b), (4) and (5) need to be revisited given that as a Titular Head of the University, the Chancellor has no executive powers and would thus be limited in giving effect to visitation, oversight and supervision or disciplining the Vice Chancellor and other Executives he appoints.

3.2.5 The Line Ministry

(1) Higher education in Uganda is supervised and regulated by the Department of Higher Education, the Department of Business, Technical and Vocational Training both under the Ministry of Education and Sports and NCHE which is semi-autonomous. The same Ministry is also responsible for Pre-Primary, Primary, Secondary, Teacher Education, Technical Education, and Sports.

(2) The Visitation Committee is in agreement with the observations of the Omaswa Task Force, that the Scope of Work of the Ministry of Education and Sports is so wide. There is therefore limited capacity for effective supervision and oversight of higher education.

(3) The Committee further observed the creation of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, with the National Council for Science and Technology and Uganda Industrial Research Institute within its remit. This Ministry does not have a direct relationship with Higher Education, a primary stakeholder in the Science, Technology and Innovation process. To improve the management and regulation of higher education and optimise the strategy and resources for Science, Technology and Innovation, there is need to define and harmonise the roles of all institutions that govern, manage and regulate higher education to synergise with governance and management structures for Science, Technology and Innovations.

(4) Higher education has been observed in other countries to be in a Ministry along with Science and Technology for a meaningful value chain, while the Ministry of Education typically takes care of Pre-Primary Education, Primary Education, Special Needs & Inclusive Education, Secondary Education, Technical & Vocational Education, Teacher Training, and Sports. This is the case in the Republic of Cuba, which was benchmarked by the Committee. Consequently, Cuba has reaped a lot by linking higher education and training to industry, and exporting her skilled human resource.

3.2.6 The National Council for Higher Education

(1) The composition, structure and funding of NCHE limit its capacity to regulate higher education.
The Act provides for constituency-based membership of the NCHE, with members nominating the Chairperson and electing the Vice Chairperson. This system is bound to be affected by conflict of interest, since some members are drawn from the same universities they regulate. Additionally, there is no open and transparent criterion for selecting representatives of the public on the NCHE.

(2) The Committee further observed that the NCHE has not developed clear regulations for Protocols for Visitations by the NCHE to Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions. The Council has not set the ethical Standards for members of the University as mandated by the Act; and the Council has no Regulations outlining the Minimum Requirements and standards for formation of constituent colleges and campuses for public Universities and other Tertiary Institutions.

(3) The Committee during interactions with the executive of the NCHE was informed about the funding limitations faced by the NCHE impairing its capacity to attract and retain high performing staff and consequently incapacity to fully undertake its prescribed mandate.

(4) The following amendments to UOTIA, 2001 as amended, were adopted by the Committee from proposals by the NCHE (The Committee only presented those proposal which are consistent with its position).

PART II - ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Section 5(i)
Minimum standards for courses of study and equating of qualifications.

Proposed Amendment
The terms “award of qualifications” and “recognition” should be added in this section to read; “to ensure minimum standards for courses of study, the award of qualifications after a period of study, the equating and recognition of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded by the different …institutions.”

Reason for Amendment
The NCHE should be empowered to inquire into a complaint, the quality of awards issued by the different public and private institutions and therefore decide on whether or not to recognise such awards.

Section 5 (ja) (inserted by the UOTIA Amendment Act of 2006)

Proposed Amendment
This section states that one of the roles of the NCHE shall be to require and ensure that all universities, whether public or private adhere to minimum criteria set by the NCHE for admission to under graduate and higher degree programmes.

The words; “...and Award of...” should be inserted after the words “admission to…”

Reason for Amendment
This will give the NCHE the power to control awards and minimise fraudulently obtained qualifications.

Section 5 (k)

Verification of qualifications should also include a mechanism of enforcing a means of withdrawing the license in case of non-compliance.

Proposed Amendment
This section states that one of the roles of the NCHE shall be to verify and determine the equivalence of all types of academic and professional qualifications of degrees; diplomas and certificates obtained elsewhere with those awarded by Ugandan institutions of Higher Education for recognition in Uganda. The words; “...Verify and...” should be inserted before the word: “...determine...”
Reason for Amendment

NCHE should be given powers to verify and determine the equivalency of all types of academic and professional qualifications under this section and not only those of politicians. The current Law does not provide for this.

Section 5 (n)

Proposed Correction

The word carrier should be replaced with career

Section 5(r)

License any student recruitment agencies operating in Uganda and any activities by foreign institutions in the field of higher education.

Section 10(5) - Quorum of the Council

Proposed Amendment

The practice now is that the quorum is represented in fraction form. One half plus one (1/2 + 1) is the quorum recommended, this implies that Quorum for the NCHE is 7 Members.

PART VII – ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

Section 22

Establishment of a Public University

Proposed amendment

(1) The Minister may by Statutory Instrument, on the recommendation of NCHE and by resolution of Parliament, establish a Public University.

(2) The rules, which apply to the establishment of Private Universities, should also apply to Public Universities which shall include being chartered.

Reason for Amendment

Public Universities should also be given chance to develop from a provisional status to a Chartered status.

3.2.7 The Role of the Chancellor of a Public University

Section 30 of the Law, provides for the appointment of a Chancellor by the President for each Public University on the recommendation of the University Council. The Law provides that the Chancellor is the titular head of the University and presides at all ceremonial assemblies of the University, and confers degrees and other academic titles and distinctions of the respective University.

The Committee is in agreement with the recommendation of the Omaswa Task Force that the Chancellor of a Public University should be ceremonial in line with Section 30 (1), (2), & (3), and the position should be held by a person of high standing in society such as a celebrated academician, entrepreneur or distinguished statesman.

The NCHE should provide regulations for the person specifications of individuals eligible for the position of Chancellor of a Public University.

3.2.8 Admission of Students to a Public University

Section 28 of UOTIA, 2001, as amended, makes the following provisions in regard to Admission to a Public University.

(1) Admission to a Public University shall be open to all qualified citizens of Uganda and without discrimination.

(2) It shall be lawful for the Public University to admit to the University any person qualified for admission who is not a citizen of Uganda.

(3) The Admission Committee of a Public University shall take into consideration affirmative action in favor of marginalised groups on the basis of gender, disability and disadvantaged schools.
The Committee noted the role played by the Public Universities Joint Admissions Board (PUJAB). However, although its role in handling admissions under the Government Merit and District Quarter Scholarship Scheme is vital, the Board is not legally established. The Committee noted that the structural relationship between PUJAB and the Admission Board at Makerere University, a Committee of Senate and the Admissions Committee provided for under Section 28 (3) & (4) of the Act, as amended, is not clearly defined.

3.3 THE COUNCIL OF A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

3.3.1 Composition and Size of Makerere University Council

(1) Makerere University Council is composed of 24 members (ref. Table 3.3.1): 10 are Staff of Makerere University with voting rights, representing different constituencies; 2 are Students of Makerere University with voting rights; and 12 represent different interest groups outside Makerere University including Government. This composition with 50% Non-Independent members (Staff and Students) results into conflict of interest clouding objectivity in making decisions affecting the University. Among these include decisions pertaining to Salary Enhancement, and involvement of Council in operational rather than strategic affairs of the University.

Figure 3.3.1: Members of Makerere University Council interacting with the Committee during a Validation Meeting
Table 3.3.1: Members of Makerere University Council as of March 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Constituency/Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Chairperson of the University Council / Government Appointee</td>
<td>Eng. Dr. Charles Wana-Etyem</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Vice-Chairperson of the University Council/ Council appointee from the Public</td>
<td>Hon. Irene Ovonji Odida</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A representative of a sector relevant to the University depending on its objectives</td>
<td>Eng. Dr. D.K. Turahi</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and mission, appointed by the relevant body in that sector- Ministry of ICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A member of the District Council elected by the District Council in whose jurisdiction</td>
<td>Ms. D Nyanjura</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Public University is situated- KCCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A member of the Convocation elected by the Convocation:</td>
<td>Dr. F. Odoi Tanga</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A member appointed by the Minister from the public</td>
<td>Hon. Justice S.B.K Kavuma</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A member appointed by the Minister from the public</td>
<td>Mr. Bruce Balaba</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A member appointed by the University Council from the public</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Tayebwa</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A member appointed by the University Council from the public</td>
<td>Dr. S.B. Maloba</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A representative of the Ministry responsible for finance</td>
<td>Mr. William Ndoleeriire</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A representative of the Ministry responsible for higher education</td>
<td>Mrs. E.K.M Gabona</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A representative of persons with disabilities, one elected by the members of staff</td>
<td>Mr. C.J Ninsiima</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>who are disabilities and another by National Organisations of persons with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Vice-Chancellor of the Public University</td>
<td>Prof. J. Ddumba-Ssentamu</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Finance and Administration)</td>
<td>Prof. B. Nawangwe</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)</td>
<td>Prof. E. Okello-Ogwang</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A member of the University Senate elected by the Senate</td>
<td>Prof. Sarah Kiguli</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A member of the University Senate elected by the Senate</td>
<td>Dr. Umar Kakumba</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A member of the Academic Staff elected by the Academic Staff Association of the Public University</td>
<td>Dr. Winston Tumps Ireeta</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A member of the Academic Staff elected by the Academic Staff Association of the Public University</td>
<td>Dr. Sarah N. Ssali</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A senior member of Administrative Staff elected by the Senior Administrative Staff;</td>
<td>Dr. Euzobia Baine Mugisha</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A member of the National Union of Education Institutions Support Staff elected by the</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Musoke</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>branch in that University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A representative of persons with disabilities, elected by the members of staff who are</td>
<td>Mr. George, W, Opee</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persons with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A male student of the University, appointed by the Students Union</td>
<td>Guild President</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A female student of the University, appointed by the Students Union</td>
<td>Vice Guild President</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The Law lays out the membership of the University Council but does not make provision for the qualifications and attributes of the members. The Law only provides that the members from the public appointed by the Minister and the University are supposed to come from different public sectors including farmers, industry, commerce and other professions. It is vital that the members of the supreme organ of a public
University are persons of a specific caliber. It is not enough to provide for the sectors from which these members are appointed. There is a need to further provide for their qualifications and attributes.

(3) From the data collected through administering a self-assessment questionnaire to members of Makerere University Council, the Committee noted that there is a deficiency in terms of the diversity in key competencies required for a governing council of a higher education institution of the stature of Makerere University. This could explain shortcomings cited by some Council members such as caucusing and politicking when making crucial council decisions. The principle of collective responsibility by Council members was also found to be weak as members tended to make decisions based on the interests of their constituencies.

(4) The Committee observed that the size of Council is too big for meaningful consideration of business compared to best practices for governance bodies of that nature.

(5) Best practice has shown that while the student representation on University Boards and/or Council adds value in ensuring that their voices are heard at the top policy organ of the University and that their participation entrenches their sense of ownership, their full mutually re-enforcing participation is limited by the short-span of the one year term for the individuals representing the students to be as effective as would have been desirable.

(6) With regard to best practices on the composition and attributes of University Council members, Stellenbosch University (South Africa) offered a useful example. The University is regulated by the Higher Education Act 101 of 1997 (as amended) which mandates the Council of a public higher education institution to make an institutional statute, to give effect to any matter not expressly prescribed by the Act; and to make institutional rules to give effect to the institutional statute. The University Council of Stellenbosch University in exercise of this mandate came up with the Institutional Statute of Stellenbosch University of September, 2016. This Statute provides that members of council should be persons with experience relevant to the aims and activities of the University and are duty-bound to act in the best interests of the University and in accordance with the code of conduct of members of council.

(7) With regard to Kenya, universities are regulated by the Universities Act No. 42/2012. The qualifications of the chairperson and the council members are set out in the Act. The chairperson of the council should hold a doctorate degree from a university recognised in Kenya. The other members should hold at least a master’s degree from a university recognised in Kenya and at least five years’ experience in leadership, management or academia. The members must be persons of high moral character and integrity in accordance with Chapter 6 of the Constitution and capable of contributing to university education.

3.3.2 Functions and Powers of a Council of a Public University

(1) The functions of a University Council as provided for in Section 40 of UOTIA 2001 as amended, do not comprehensively address the core functions of a higher education institution’s supreme governing body.

(2) The University Council is a deliberative forum which exists to consider the activities of the University in all its phases, with particular attention to those matters that affect the common interests of Staff and Students. It is mandated to initiate policy proposals as well as express its judgment on those submitted to it by the Officers of the
University and its various academic units. It is also empowered to request information from any member of the University through appropriate channels. To be able to effectively carry out this mandate a lot of strategy in policy formulation and buffeting functions are required.

(3) The Committee observed that the powers of the University Council as provided for under Section 41 of the Act require to be strengthened.

3.3.3 The Makerere University Council Charter, 2012

Makerere University Council developed the Council Charter, 2012 setting out the standards under which Council shall perform its duties.

The Visitation Committee observed that while great effort was taken in developing the Charter, a fundamental aspect of such a Charter is the Code of Ethics for Members of Council and Committees of Council, which was omitted. Other important issues including the relationship between Council and other Governance bodies of the University such as Senate as well as the Boards and Committees at the Colleges, the process of approval of the Charter, among others are also not clearly provided for.

3.3.4 Conduct of Business/Meetings of Council

The Committee accessed minutes of Council Meetings for the period FY2009/2010 to FY2014/2015 and observed that Council over-emphasised tactical matters at the expense of strategic focus. Council business was dominated by deliberation on detailed operational matters that would be the province of the University Management to resolve rather than bringing these to Council for decision. Council should instead allow ample latitude to itself to debate strategy implementation, reports on delegated administrative matters and accountability and responsibility to stakeholders. To provide and to monitor strategic direction of the institution,, it is important that regular Council Meetings are held in a manner that enables Council Members to discharge their responsibility to provide strategic and policy direction, and to monitor the exercise of delegated authority so that the respective Committees and Directorate Heads can report on execution in their particular areas of responsibility for Council consideration and decisions.

3.3.4.1 Nature of Council Business: The Committee was informed that neither did strategy execution feature prominently at regular meetings of Council nor was there evidence of strategy review at special Council meetings. Although several reviews, i.e. annual performance reviews, mid-term strategy reviews, process reviews, and University annual reporting were recommended in the Makerere University Organisational Manual 2011 and endorsed by Council as critical to execution success, visible results could not be ascertained.

3.3.4.2 Commitment to Council Business: Despite the accommodated notion that a Council Member may not be able to attend each board meeting, the clear norm is that full attendance is expected. The self-assessment on working experience revealed that some members’ time commitment to Council affairs could be affected by the existence of concurrent board duties whereby 2 members occupied 7 and 6 board positions respectively, 2 members occupied 4 positions in addition to other academic or non-academic responsibilities within or outside the University.

3.3.4.3 Council Meetings: Since the University Council’s main business is conducted during its meetings, the quality of meetings provides a dependable litmus test on Council effectiveness. The Committee noted a remarkable disregard for the distinct Council business cycles which should guide the character and organisation of Council meetings. Council business should be divided into 3 classic activity cycles:
The Council Meetings Cycle: This cycle should be composed of regular and sporadic meetings (special and emergency meetings) with the regular meetings guided by an annual calendar of meetings. The calendar would help in meeting preparation, re-scheduling meetings, holding meetings and all post-meeting follow-ups.

The Annual Council Cycle: This cycle would be focused on recurrent Council responsibilities which are annual in nature such as policy reviews, compliances, budget, audit, work plans, and strategy reviews. The administrators of Council business would distinguish between responsibilities that merit exclusive meetings and ones to embed into regular or allocate to special meetings.

The Council Development Cycle: Over the duration of their respective tenures, Council Members chart through developmental, engagement and transitional stages. For sustainability, continuity and smooth succession, the integrated development cycle will manage individual members’ terms, the nomination process, new member induction and Council education to enhance individual members’ and collective performance.

The Visitation Committee observed that Council meetings are lengthy, crowded with nuts-and-bolts coverage and oftentimes inconclusive. This was observed to arise from the random or ad hoc structuring of agenda for regular meetings. This shortcoming together with the detected backward nature of most meetings overwhelmed by historical updates and administrative items could be reversed by Council imbibing a culture of holding effective adequately pre-planned meetings.

3.3.5 Induction of New Council Members

Respondents to the self-assessment tool administered by the Committed indicated that there was no formal induction of new Council members and appropriate training and development for effective discharge of their responsibilities. It is imperative that Council Members are duly sensitised of their fiduciary duties which require them to individually act in good faith and for proper purposes consistent with the objects and interests of the University. In acting for proper purposes Council Members dutifully exercise their individual powers and discretion consistent with the purpose for which the power or discretion is conferred and must not use such powers for improper, irrelevant or inappropriate purposes. The degree of awareness of the importance of adopting corporate governance best practices for the sustainability of the University appears to be fairly limited in the University Council.

3.3.6 Evaluation of Council Performance

Good governance requires the University Council to ensure accountability and transparency by instituting a streamlined regular process to evaluate its performance and that of its Committees, its Chairperson and individual members, to support progressive enhancement in its performance and effectiveness.

The Committee recognised that whereas Makerere University Council approved a Council Evaluation Policy, no Council evaluation has ever been carried out. It therefore follows that there are no performance review mechanisms for Council Members. With no evaluation of the Council Members both individually and collectively, it is difficult to identify the strengths and the areas of improvement for such a Council.

The Committee undertook a Self-Assessment exercise of Makerere University Council. The 24 Council members were invited to participate in the evaluation exercise by providing
responses to a predefined set of question and additionally providing a memorandum on challenges faced in discharging Council duties and plausible solutions.

Notwithstanding the legal requirement in the UOTIA 2001 as amended, to provide requisite information to the Visitation Committee, only 16 Council Members out of 24 responded to the self-assessment instrument issued by the Visitation Committee. Therefore a demonstrated commitment to serve the University at this critical era has not been forthcoming from some constituencies. The salient finding is that higher commitment levels are prevalent amongst ex-officio members, internal constituencies and ‘independent external members compared to external constituencies.

**Results of Makerere University Council Self-Assessment**: The evaluation of the University Council performance yielded insightful findings in the benchmark areas of: (i) Council Appointment and Development; (ii) Conduct of Council Meetings and Affairs: (iii) Compliance with Laws, Rules, Codes, Manuals, Policies and Standards: (iv) Council Performance Assessment and Review; and (v) Stakeholder Relationships and Engagement. Council Members were tasked to assess their collective performance at the University Council along a rating scale (1- strongly disagree; 2- disagree; 3-agree; and 4-strongly agree). The respondents’ weighted verdicts on each self-assessed performance statement are exhibited in the resultant radar charts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Council Appointment and Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A The size of council is adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B University Council members representing constituencies of interest are appointed based on the skills and competences needed around the Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C New University Council members undergo induction to prepare them for their governance roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D University Council members receive appropriate training and development for effective discharge of their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E The University Council plans for the succession of the vice chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F The University Council plans for the succession of council members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G The Minimum Qualifications and Experience of Council Members should be Specified in Regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.3.6 (a): Self-Assessment on Council Appointment and Development**

**Statement A**: Members disagreed that the Council size is appropriate.

**Statement B**: Members disagreed that skills and competences were a criteria for appointing constituency-based representatives.

**Statements C and D**: Members disagreed that new members were properly inducted and that incumbent members had undergone appropriate training and development for their Council roles.

**Statement E**: Members disagreed that the Council plans for the VC’s succession

**Statement F**: Members disagreed that the Council plans for Council Members’ succession.

**Statement G**: Members strongly agreed on the need to specify minimum qualifications and competences for Council Members appropriately.
Figure 3.3.6 (b): Self-Assessment on Conduct of Council Meetings and Affairs

Members agreed with the statements C, D, E, F and H but disagreed with A, B, G, I, J and K. Members’ pronouncement of a strong verdict against the quality of Council Meetings in all assessed provinces, points to the absence of adequately broad meeting rules and guidelines on the conduct of meetings.

Figure 3.3.6 (c): Self-Assessment on Compliance with Laws, Rules, Codes, Manuals, Policies and Standards

Members agreed that the University Council has no strong compliance framework. Council’s authority is significantly weakened if Council Members set but feebly exemplify the compliance norms of the University. For example, the University Council approval of annual work plans and budgets that are at variance with the Strategic Plan it endorsed as the University’s logic of action for achieving long-term goals and for maintaining its competitive advantage tempers the primary governance responsibility of the Council to provide strategic direction and oversight of the University.

3.3.7 Standing Committees

It was observed that the Standing Committees of Makerere University Council do not comprehensively cover the required governance outlook of Council. The Committees to handle Nominations and Governance as well as Risk Management are not part of the current structure.

The UOTIA 2001 as amended, is quite prescriptive to mention Appointments Board as a Committee of Council but is silent about the other Committees. Section 43 of the Act mandates the University Council to appoint Committees and Boards consisting of such number of its members and other persons as it may deem necessary. The number of
Committees and the composition of these Committees under the Law lies with the University Council. Making regulations for standing Committees of Council would tantamount to amendment of the Law.

3.3.8 Membership (Nomination & Appointment, Professional Profile, Term, Exit)

The Committee noted the existence of near lifetime members of Council metamorphosing from representation of one constituency to another for Council membership longevity. Six (6) of the respondents to the self-assessment had served 6 to 10 years and one (1) member had served on the Council for 20 years. This level of entrenchment is achievable by way of cross-constituency migrations which does not breach the Principal Act in any way. This legal shortcoming permits incumbent members ample latitude for maneuver by switching constituencies at mandate expiry. This promotes negative group culture whereby long-serving members dominate Council business with old methods of doing things at the expense of innovative ideas and advice emanating from new members. This greatly affects Council effectiveness given the time taken for new members’ contributions to be appreciated for the value they add to collective performance.

During the Committee’s interaction with the University Council, Council Members proposed a two-term mandate of four years each. The recommended solution is to include in the Act a limitation clause placing a curb on the number of representation shifts for a Council Member.

3.3.9 Emoluments of Council Members

Section 42(6) of the Act provides that members of the University Council shall be paid such allowances as the Council may determine, taking into account other allowances in the public sector.

During the Council self-assessment the Committee observed that there is no clear policy on University Council Emoluments at Makerere University. It was further noted that the Chair and Vice Chair attracted a monthly retainer of UGX 3,000,000.

Good governance practice requires that to avoid conflict of interest, members of the supreme governing body should not receive remuneration but may be entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable traveling, accommodation and other expenses incurred in traveling to or from attending Council meetings. The payment of retainers to Council members should be abolished.

3.3.10 Discipline and Removal of Council Members

The Committee noted that there are no defined procedures for disciplinary action on Council members whether individually or for Council as a whole. The Governance Charter does not provide detailed circumstances that constitute misconduct by a Council member and the resultant action on such a member.

3.3.11 Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder Inclusivity: is an approach in which the governing body takes into account the legitimate and reasonable needs, interests and expectations of all material stakeholders in the execution of its duties in the best interest of the organisation over time. By following this approach instead of prioritising the interest of the providers of financial capital, the governing body gives parity to all sources of value creation including among others social and relationship capital as embodied by stakeholders.

While it is important that stakeholder engagement be promoted, members of governing bodies must act, and be perceived to act, impartially, and not be influenced by social or business relationships and must ensure that its decision-making processes are free of any
undue pressures from external interest groups, including donors, alumni, corporate sponsors and political interest groups.

It was observed that the systems and structures for stakeholder inclusivity at Makerere University are deficient. Consequently, there have been several cases of external intervention to balance the advance of perceived unsustainable policies and resolutions of Council with the need for business continuity at Makerere University.

3.3.12 Management of Property of a Public University

The Act provides that all funds, assets and property movable and immoveable of a Public University shall be managed and utilised by the University Council in accordance with this Act in such purposes as shall promote the best interest of the University. The University Council is also given powers by the Act to dispose of the immovable property of a University. Some Members of the University Council and Staff have highlighted the several challenges with regard to the management of University property leading to: the poor state of housing facilities some of which have been condemned; land grabbing; lack of facilities like furniture, computers, projectors, etc. Reports also indicate incessant wrangles particularly connected to Makerere University land.

3.3.13 Makerere University Reforms, 2009-2011

Makerere University undertook major reforms between 2009 and 2011 in its Academic, Research and Financial processes. The Special Committee that handled the reform process was known as the University Research, Administrative, and Financial Reforms Committee (URAFR) chaired by Professor Barnabas Nawangwe during the term of Professor Venansious Baryamureeba as the Vice Chancellor. The URAFR Committee reviewed over 40 key processes in the University spanning across Teaching and Learning, Research and Innovations, and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships & Networking. The Reforms Committee produced a report, the University Organisational Manual, as well as the Research Manual.

Subsequent work done by a successor Committee, the Change Management Committee, saw the production of more institutional manuals: the Financial Procedures Manual, the Procurement Manual and the Audit Manual.

The Makerere University Administrative, Finance and Research review and proposed reforms greatly informed the establishment of the 10 Constituent Colleges and the process of operationalisation of the collegiate system at Makerere University.

The McGregor Committee recommended the review of the structures for Administrative Units at Makerere University; this was also raised by the Omaswa Taskforce. It is imperative to note that by the time of the current visitation, the restructuring of Administrative Units at Makerere University was not yet complete and the process seemed to have stalled.

3.4 THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

(1) Section 44 of the Act provides for the Senate of a Public University whose maximum number of members shall be determined by the University Council from time to time, but the ex-officio members shall not be reduced. The Senate membership at the time of visitation stood at 87.

(2) The Committee observed through best practices benchmarking that Senate provides a forum for Executives, Managers, Staff, Students and other key stakeholders as may be deemed relevant to provide strategic oversight for all academic matters of the University.
(3) The Committee noted that the prescription of the membership of Senate in the Principal Act is restrictive. In addition, it was also noted that it limits the relevance of Senate’s mandate in the dynamic pursuit of excellence with specific reference to the Strategic Plan of a particular University. Further, the above situation leads to challenges of creating an overarching framework for members taking into account the diverse governance and management models a public university may select; for instance, on the collegiate system vs faculty-based model, off-shore campus model, amongst others.

(4) It was further observed that while Senate is provided for in the Act, Makerere University neither developed a Handbook nor a Charter to provide for Committees, rules of procedure, among others.

(5) The alignment of Senate to the collegiate system is not provided for by the Law. Senate procedures are currently tailored to the faculty-based model.

(6) The Committee noted the deficiencies in the academic oversight role of Senate for assurance of the reputation of Makerere University given the overwhelming allegations of academic malfeasance by Staff and Students ranging from falsification of student academic records to outright indiscipline by staff who neglect their duties of teaching and examination in line with the University approved timetables.

(7) The Committee further observed duplication of and fragmentation of programmes, especially undergraduate degree programmes, without market value justification. This points to weaknesses in Senate in streamlining the curriculum development and review systems at Makerere University.

3.5 MAKERERE UNIVERSITY CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

3.5.1 The Vice Chancellor

Section 31 of the Law provides for the Vice Chancellor of a Public University and how the VC should be appointed. The Law also provides for the removal of the Vice Chancellor (VC) by Council. However the Law is quite weak on the appraisal of and disciplinary action against top managers.

The Committee in the course of their engagement with both Staff and Students received complaints of discontent against the top managers for failure to address complaints about mismanagement of marks and sexual harassment, respectively. This is a demonstration that the leadership styles and qualities necessary to inspire greatness are missing at Makerere University.

3.5.2 Top Management Team

(1) The Makerere University governance chart indicates the presence of the Management as a governance body at Makerere University. The Committee observed that there is indeed a Management Team which meets once every week chaired by the VC and includes the Officers of the University as prescribed in UOTIA, 2001 as amended, sections 31-37.

(2) The Committee noted that the Law, the College Statute, 2012, and the Makerere University Council Charter, 2012 do not provide the functions, powers, composition, ethical standards, and rules of procedure of Top Management.

(3) The Committee further observed that Principals of Colleges in their capacity as the Chief Academic and Administrative Officers of Colleges, and also delegates of the University Secretary as sub-accounting Officers are not part of Management. This
creates a gap between the College Administrative Boards and Top Management where they ideally should be presenting resolutions from the College Administrative Boards.

3.5.3 The Deputy Vice Chancellors

(1) The Committee noted that the two DVCs at Makerere University are appointed in line with the provisions of the UOTIA, 2001 as amended, Section 32.

(2) The Committee also noted the submissions from consultative meetings and from the Omaswa Task Force about the need for more than two DVCs.

(3) Through best practices benchmarking, the Committee observed that Universities in the United States typically have a President as equivalent to VC; a Provost as equivalent to DVC AA and Executive Vice President and Treasurer as equivalent to the DVC FA. The rationale for the number of DVCs of a Public University should be informed by the underlying Job derived from the strategy of the Public University in question. While there is need for deputising the VC the size of certain universities and the resources available to such universities may limit the number of DVCs to one while others may need several DVCs given the scope of work and resources.

3.5.4 The University Secretary

The University Secretary (US) is also the Accounting Officer of the University as provided for in the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA), 2015 (as amended), and is responsible for ensuring that the accountability obligations of the University are met. In line with the PFMA, he/she is responsible for the general administration of the University, including custody of the Seal. He/she is further supposed to ensure that adequate controls are exercised over commitments and that effective systems of internal controls are put in place in respect of all transactions and resources under his/her control. In addition, he/she is supposed to ensure that the internal audit function is in place and operational.

A review of the operating environment of the University Secretary revealed the following:

(1) The Function of the US is provided for in the Law, as well as in the PFMA, 2015, as amended. The Committee observed a conflict of duties between the functions of the US and the VC as stipulated in the two Laws. Section 31 of UOTIA 2001, as amended, provides that the VC is responsible for the financial affairs of the University while the US is charged with the general administration of the University and Accounting Officer.

(2) The Act provides that the US shall be answerable to the VC. However, under the PFMA, 2015, as amended, the Accounting Officer is responsible and personally accountable to Parliament and PS/ST for the activities of the University.

(3) The functionality of the US provides a stark difference with his duty to report to the VC considering the fact that the US is personally culpable and responsible for all monies and assets of the University.

3.5.5 The Directorates and Departments at the Centre

(1) The Committee noted that when the collegiate system was operationalised at Makerere University, University Council undertook to restructure the Central Administrative Units to bear relevance under the collegiate system. This process has stalled.
(2) The Human Resource, Finance, Academic Registrar’s, and Procurement Departments are not only lacking the basic automation of processes, but similar to other Units, encumbered with staffing challenges ranging from a large number of temporary staff to dysfunctional administrative structures.

(3) The Committee for example observed the structural challenges between the Finance Department and the Academic Registrar’s Department in handling student registration and fees collection; a similar challenge was observed between the Finance Department and Directorate of Human Resource Management in payroll management. While these are highlighted here, the Committee observed that all Administrative Units at the Centre require urgent restructuring and optimisation to align them with the collegiate system and also position them to support the realisation of the University’s Strategic Goals.

(4) The issues associated with failure by the University to establish student enrolment and staff employed are symptoms of the systemic and structural challenges requiring urgent attention. *Table 3.5.5:* presents the wage bill projections for Administrative Units at Makerere University 2016/17 highlighting the significant wage bill to Part-Time Staff in Administrative Units.

### Table 3.5.5: Wage Bill Projections for Administrative Units at Makerere University 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>Non-Teaching (UGX)</th>
<th>Part-Time (UGX)</th>
<th>Monthly Total (UGX)</th>
<th>Annual Total (UGX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic Registrar's Department</td>
<td>420,303,448</td>
<td>420,303,448</td>
<td>5,043,641,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>161,195,578</td>
<td>13,276,457</td>
<td>174,472,035</td>
<td>2,093,664,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Halls</td>
<td>217,047,596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,047,596</td>
<td>2,604,571,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Directorate of ICT Support</td>
<td>71,602,682</td>
<td>13,276,457</td>
<td>84,879,139</td>
<td>1,018,549,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estates Department</td>
<td>68,164,644</td>
<td>13,276,457</td>
<td>81,441,101</td>
<td>977,293,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finance Department</td>
<td>313,540,682</td>
<td>6,638,228</td>
<td>320,178,910</td>
<td>3,842,146,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Directorate of Human Resource</td>
<td>84,045,441</td>
<td>6,638,228</td>
<td>90,683,669</td>
<td>1,088,204,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>302,398,490</td>
<td>6,638,228</td>
<td>309,036,719</td>
<td>3,708,440,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Planning And Development</td>
<td>54,407,672</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,407,672</td>
<td>652,892,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School Of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>35,566,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,566,949</td>
<td>426,803,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>41,852,241</td>
<td>33,191,142</td>
<td>75,043,383</td>
<td>900,520,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University Secretary's Office</td>
<td>174,912,119</td>
<td>13,276,457</td>
<td>188,188,576</td>
<td>2,258,262,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor's Office</td>
<td>268,368,217</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>268,368,217</td>
<td>3,220,418,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monthly (UGX):** 2,213,405,759 106,211,655 2,319,617,414 27,835,408,964

**Annual (UGX):** 26,560,869,107 1,274,539,856 27,835,408,964

Source: Department of Finance, Makerere University

### 3.5.6 Relationship between the Centre and Principals, Directors, Deans and Heads of Departments

Principals, Directors, Deans and Heads of Departments are responsible for ensuring that their respective Units comply with all requirements by Government of Uganda, Makerere University and Development Partners in the use of resources. They direct the manner in which their respective Units report on their financial activities, construct annual budgets that incorporate their means of achieving strategic objectives and mitigating unacceptable risks.
They also have to explain budget variances from expected budget conditions. Additional roles are found in the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Statute (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University), 2012. The following observations were made:

(1) The audit team was not availed with any evidence that the Principals of the different Colleges were formally appointed by the US to execute on his behalf the sub-accounting officer’s role. The Principals therefore lack the responsibility and personal accountability which comes with exercising this mandate.

(2) A review of the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statute of 2012 revealed that the College Principals are the administrative and financial officers of the Colleges and are supposed to directly report to the University Council about the execution of their mandate.

(3) The same Statute provides that the Principals are responsible to the Vice Chancellor. This is in contravention with the Public Finance Management Act, 2015 (PFMA) which gives this responsibility to the University Secretary as the overall Accounting Officer.

The fact that the US is not required to be consulted by the Principals provides a flaw in the accountability chain as he/she will not be in position to effectively execute his/her mandate as Accounting Officer.

3.6 THE MAKERERERE UNIVERSITY COLLEGIATE SYSTEM

The restructuring of Makerere University from a Faculty-Based Model with the obtaining Governance and Management Structures to a Collegiate Model was intended to create an efficient and effective model that structurally, administratively and pedagogically would enhance the management of Makerere University so as to fulfil its revised Vision and Mission as stipulated in its Strategic Plan 2008/2018. This was pursuant to section 29 of the UOTIA 2001, as amended.

The Committee was informed that in 2006, the University Council resolved to initiate the transformation of Makerere University from a Faculty-Based Model to a Collegiate Model by piloting with the College of Health Sciences. Accordingly, the NCHE, established the College of Health Sciences through Statutory Instrument No. 22 of 2008. "The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (Establishment of College of Health Sciences, Makerere University) Order, 2008.; Under Section 29(1)(b) of the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, 2001".

The NCHE established eight (8) constituent colleges of Makerere University on 19th December 2011 through Statutory Instrument No. 68 of 2011."The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (Establishment of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Order, 2011.; Under Section 29(1)(b) of the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act, 2001". Consequently, on 9th March 2012, Makerere University Council, made a Statute for the Management of Constituent Colleges, "The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions(Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University), Statute, 2012".

The Committee did not receive any record of the lessons learnt by Makerere University from the pilot of the College of Health Sciences and how these lessons could have informed the roll out of Colleges in the entire University in 2011.

The College Formation Handbookelet, 2011, presents the assumptions, rationale, criteria, structures and resource and funding requirements for the proposed 9 colleges of Makerere University.
3.6.1 Assumptions for College Formation

As outlined in the College Formation Handbooklet, 2011, Colleges were proposed under the following assumptions:

1. The formation of Colleges is meaningful and this transformation shall provide synergic academic and functional relations;
2. The Faculties, Schools or Institutes transforming into Colleges will be more effective and efficient since they will have some degree of autonomy within their institutional frames and will be able to constitute and regulate issues which are peculiar and unique to them in a more timely manner;
3. That individuals will have more influence in decision making in administration, finance and in developing programmes within their Colleges than it had been before thereby ensuring motivation towards up to date teamwork approaches in teaching and learning;
4. That the synergies created shall provide Colleges with a better scope and environment in sourcing for funds, re-organising themselves, re-branding their academic image and undertaking other activities within their mandate.

The College Formulation Handbooklet, 2011, further stated that, using the Full Time Student Equivalent (FTSE) and Workload Analytical Model, as well as qualitative cost benefit analysis by comparing re-engineered processes, the initial cost of implementation would mean an additional **27 Uganda Million Shillings** to the budget under the Faculty-Model. This would represent an increment of 0.05% due to the introduction of Communications Officers at each of the Colleges. In essence, college formation would financially imply a neutral budgetary consideration.

The Committee noted that in contradiction, the same Handbooklet observes that the actual implementation of College formation is subject to the availability of funds for the operationalisation phase. Certainly the UGX 27 Million increment resulting from recruitment of Communication Officers at M5 Salary Scale was a serious computational error which would have grossly misinformed the College formation process at Makerere University.

The Committee noted the limited devolution of powers and functions in line with the intent of restructuring the University based on a Collegiate Model. Decisions pertaining to student admission, staff recruitments, financial management, among others, are all made at the Centre. This waters down the value proposition for the Collegiate System at Makerere University.

3.6.2 Rationale for College Formation

The College Formation Handbooklet, 2011, presents the rationale for the Collegiate Model, based on best practices benchmarking of University Models world over, carried out by the Makerere University. The Handbooklet states that the collegiate model was found to be the most appropriate for the University for the following reasons:

1. It enhances decision making around the notions of efficiency and consensus.
2. Decisions made are honored in deference to the professional and intellectual competence and authority of the makers, and not through politics, rules and other persuasions (Hamilton, 1997).
3. The benefits of implementing College Formation are greater than the cost of continuing operating under a highly constrained, centralised model.
The Committee observed that the governance and management structures setup by the College Statute, 2012 create additional layers of bureaucracy with attendant costs without empirically justifiable value addition to the decision chain; thus defeating the rationale for the College model. A case study of the results consideration and approval process at the Departmental Board, School Board, College Academic Board and Senate points to a protracted process without justifiable value addition at, for example, the School Board. Furthermore, with over one hundred Academic Departments, it is such a task for Senate to comprehensively consider and approve results submitted by the 100 Academic Departments every semester. Given this situation, the Committee did not see the prospected efficiency enhancement in the University decision making process brought about by the existing status quo.

The Committee observed that the process of electing the Heads of Departments, Deans and Principles heightens political polarisation which is a replica of the practices at the Centre. This is contrary to the rationale for the collegiate model which sought to mitigate undesired political peddling within the Colleges.

3.6.3 Criteria Used for College Formation

As stated in the College Formation Handbooklet, the structure of Colleges was intentioned to utilise a coordinated devolution of powers, utilising the re-engineered process maps for effective and efficient functionality. The criterion for college configuration was therefore supposed to take cognisance of the:

1. Synergy in mission and objectives of the combining units to promote optimal utilisation of the ambient capacities;
2. Potential for resource sharing (human, infrastructural) and mobilisation;
3. Potential for modularisation of Academic Programmes, rationalisation and elimination of duplication;
4. Capacity to form viable College substructures like Academic Boards, Administrative Boards, Procurement Committees and Senate as elaborated in the College Statute;
5. Baseline Resources: Number of students; Number of Programmes; Number and distribution of Academic Staff; Teaching and office Space; Number of Computer access points; Library facilities; Laboratory space; and other capacity indicators considered by the National Council for Higher Education.

The Committee observed that much as it is within the ambits of the NCHE to establish constituent colleges of a University, the NCHE does not have minimum requirements or standards for establishment of constituent Colleges. Without a measurable criterion, the process followed at Makerere University was subjective and bound to yield questionable results.

The Committee further observed that in terms of sharing pedagogical resources such as instructional labs, Academic Staff, among others, there was a disconnect between Units of Colleges. For example, School of Public Health vs School of Medicine; School of Social Sciences vs School of Humanities; Margret Trowel School of Industrial & Fine Art vs School of Engineering; School of Computing & Informatics vs East African School of Library & Information Science negated the basis for application of the stated criteria for combining these Schools into Colleges. This is further compounded by some of the Schools being physically located outside each other’s proximity. Figure 3.6.3 & Table 3.6.3 present the structure and staffing status vs requirements of the College of Business Administration and
Management Science (COBAMS). The formulae and rationale applied in arriving at the college configuration and stated staffing requirements is not clear.

![Figure 3.6.3: Structure of College of Business Administration & Management Sciences (Source: College Formation Handbooklet, 2011)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.6.3: The Filled &amp; Required Academic Staff Establishment at COBAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College Formation Handbooklet, 2011

3.6.4 The College Statute, 2012

Makerere University Council, made a Statue for the Management of Constituent Colleges, "The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University), Statute, 2012, Legal Notice No.6 of 2012 dated 9th March 2012. The Committee observed that the Statute prescribes the Governance and Managements Structures for a 4-tier and 3-Teir College establishment at Makerere University with associated roles and responsibilities for the designated Officers; and functions and powers for the Governance Bodies. The Visitation Committee noted:
The reference to the Faculty as an entity under the collegiate system (see section 63(1)), should be an error which merits correction.

A gap in defining the relationship between the governance bodies at College level and at the University’s Central Administration.

The prescription of Administrative Staff required at College Level has omissions, for instance of the Human Resource Officers, who are currently deployed at the Colleges.

3.6.5 Governance and Management Structures under the Collegiate System

It is noted in the College Formation Handbooklet, 2011 that the proposed College structure would comprise of the College, Schools, Institutes, and Departments with the following definitions.

Table 3.6.5.1: Definitions of Units in a College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A COLLEGE</td>
<td>A Constituent Unit of the University consistent with the UOTIA as amended, and offers Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates; and enjoys Administrative, Academic and Financial semi-autonomous status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SCHOOL</td>
<td>This is an Academic Unit of a College engaged in teaching, learning, research and knowledge and technology transfer partnerships based on a focused body of Knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTE</td>
<td>This is a Unit of a College which is exclusively research based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRE</td>
<td>This is a Unit of a College, which is largely focused on service and knowledge transfer partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>This is a Unit of a School that deals with core functions of teaching, learning and research of a particular focused discipline, with at least one programme leading to the award of a degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College Formation Hand Booklet, 2011

The Committee made the following observations:

1. The definition of a Department in a College presupposed a Degree Granting Unit with at least one Degree Programme. The College of Health Sciences, College of Law (School of Law), College of Humanities and Social Science were noted not to be in compliance of this requirement as there are several departments in these Colleges without a Degree Programme.

2. The application of the term ‘Centre’ is still ambiguous and not in line with the prescribed definition. Several Centres across the University are typically termed as, “Centre for Research” and are not involved in service and knowledge transfer but predominantly research. This implies that perhaps they would have been designated Institutes by the definitions stated in Table 3.6.5.1.

3. The positions of Chair (Head of Department) and Dean are not part of the remunerated jobs in the University. Staff appointed to these positions do not get a salary for this job but are rather paid the salary associated with their academic position.

4. Nine (9) Colleges are based on a 4 tier Governance and Management Structure while the School of Law (with College Status) implements a 3-tier Governance and Management Structure.

5. The analysis of key structures and metrics of Colleges at Makerere University as of November 2016 (See Table 3.6.5.2) highlighted a number of pertinent concerns.
Table 3.6.5.2: Analysis of Key Structures and Metrics of Colleges at Makerere University as of November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>D:S</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Academic Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>SSR</th>
<th>NCHE SSR (Ideal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>1:56</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>1:72</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>8,435</td>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>1:26</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1:11</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:27</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Quality Assurance Department, Makerere University

The Committee made the following observations:-

(1) The College of Humanities and Social Sciences is too big (21 Departments; 7 Schools; and 82 programmes etc.).

(2) The Colleges of Health Sciences is too big (29 Departments; 58 Programmes; 295 Academic Staff) and Services Mulago Hospital under the Ministry of Health.

(3) The Committee is in agreement with the Omaswa Taskforce recommendation that the relationship between Mulago Hospital and Makerere University should be streamlined with a well conceptualised MoU to ensure that Makerere University benefits from the services rendered to the Hospital. The Committee noted that Makerere University has initiated a project to develop a teaching hospital at Katalemwa.

(4) The School of Law with College Status has one Bachelor’s Degree Programme, 41 Academic Staff and 1,309 Students. This College is so small for administrative purposes compared to other Colleges. While one may advance the uniqueness of the discipline, the Committee observed that practices elsewhere provide for configuration of Colleges with multiple disciplines which may not be closely related, especially where Colleges are located off the main campus.

(5) There is need to check the growing number of programmes in the College of Veterinary, Animal Science and Biodiversity (COVAB). This College does not have the required resources including Staff; lecture rooms lab space and equipment, among others; for running the programmes. The Committee observed that the Labs and animal houses have been converted into lecture rooms. The Committee recommends that the University explores the development of Buyana Stock Farm strategically to host COVAB in the long-term. In the short-term the Programmes in COVAB should be reduced or merged to match the available resources.

(6) The College of Education and External Studies; the College of Business and Management Sciences; and the College of Computing and Information Sciences have very high student numbers compared to the available staff and other critical pedagogical resources.

(7) Some Departments at Makerere University could be over staffed while others are understaffed as illustrated in Table 3.6.5.3. Given that the recommended establishment for an Academic Department is 14 Staff. The Committee recommends...
that this be reviewed, and if it still stands, then Departments should not be run with 7 or less; or more than 28 Academic Staff.

Table 3.6.5.3: Departments with Staffing Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Agricultural Production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Policy Planning and Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Human Rights and Peace Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) The current structure for Administrative Staff in Colleges translates into a significantly high wage bill. There is need to justify the Administrative Staff in Colleges. This will require a thorough Job Analysis to establish what level of staffing is required to perform the tasks at College level.

(9) There are structural anomalies in the relationship between the Governance and Management Structures at the College and the Centre. It is recommended that the said relationships be further studied and streamlined. For example: the relationship between the College Academic Board and Senate; the relationship between the College Bursar and the University Bursar; the relationship between the College Administrative Board and Council or Top Management; among others.

3.6.6 Financial Analysis of Collegiate System at Makerere University

The Committee noted that the Financial Analysis for the restructuring of Makerere University from a Faculty Model to a Collegiate System was not comprehensively undertaken. Table 3.6.6.1 presents the analysis done, with focus on the wage bill for Academic and Administrative Staff. Table 3.6.6.2 presents the aggregated costs of the University in FY 2016/17 against revenues generated by Colleges through Student fee collections.

Table 3.6.6.1: Summary of Cost Implications in UGX (Excluding Support Staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Staff Category</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Restructured</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>27,294,283,998</td>
<td>27,294,283,998</td>
<td>38,660,809,821</td>
<td>69,321,044,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>1,052,961,361</td>
<td>1,052,961,361</td>
<td>1,614,635,256</td>
<td>3,229,270,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admin Staff (M-10) Centre</td>
<td>4,021,513,672</td>
<td>2,391,321,514</td>
<td>2,391,321,514</td>
<td>3,727,132,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Admin Staff (M-10) Colleges</td>
<td>778,385,084</td>
<td>231,737,630</td>
<td>231,737,630</td>
<td>3,505,030,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,147,144,115</td>
<td>30,970,304,503</td>
<td>42,898,504,221</td>
<td>79,782,477,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: College Formation HandBooklet, 2011

The figures presented in Table 3.6.6.1 point to incomplete financial analysis. The University should have embarked on restructuring after developing a comprehensive Financial Model for the proposed collegiate system, with projections of cost structures and revenue streams for at least 20 years, the associated cash flow statement, resource follow statement and the objectives with measurable indicators of the restructuring. When major restructuring interventions of this magnitude are undertaken without exploring a non-negative business case scenario and the obtaining breakeven analysis, the chances of successful implementation are limited if any. Furthermore, without clearly laying out what was to be accomplished by the restructuring project in measurable terms it is difficult to know whether the set goals have been realised.

Tables 3.6.6.2 present aggregated costs vs tuition revenues for Colleges and Administrative Units at Makerere University. This spread points to a financial crisis at Makerere University.
### Table 3.6.6.2: Makerere University Income & Expenditure Schedule as of May FY 2016/17 by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th># of Registered Students</th>
<th># of Academic Staff</th>
<th>Revenue Collected (UGX)</th>
<th>Expenditure (UGX)</th>
<th>Total OpEx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wage Bill</td>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4,310,459,914</td>
<td>9,828,352,151</td>
<td>15,219,349,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7,343,393,357</td>
<td>7,260,809,641</td>
<td>12,443,085,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>6,716</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10,480,783,689</td>
<td>7,803,514,656</td>
<td>9,227,855,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>4,925,270,735</td>
<td>14,117,319,088</td>
<td>14,981,629,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>8,333</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>15,948,354,120</td>
<td>17,595,223,346</td>
<td>18,755,171,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14,954,878,616</td>
<td>6,953,184,026</td>
<td>7,877,251,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>3,994</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11,018,344,906</td>
<td>5,423,636,753</td>
<td>6,831,172,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,470,012,310</td>
<td>7,763,328,043</td>
<td>8,222,345,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,301,479,054</td>
<td>5,432,371,226</td>
<td>6,934,828,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3,182,545,164</td>
<td>3,323,688,507</td>
<td>3,622,175,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FORTPORTAL Campus</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>254,263,500</td>
<td>71,888,008</td>
<td>231,621,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>JINJA Campus</td>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td>811,288,560</td>
<td>397,503,334</td>
<td>397,503,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78,001,073,925</td>
<td>85,573,315,445</td>
<td>105,343,860,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Finance Department, Makerere University

The Committee observed that the intent to restructure Makerere University to be governed and managed based on a Collegiate System Model was noble and with careful consideration the way to go.

However, the process was not meticulously undertaken, as the University found itself abandoning the pilot study and proceeding with a complete rollout without proper planning. The Committee concluded that such reforms with far reaching structural, financial and legal implications cannot be objectively undertaken by the University on her own.
3.6.7 Makerere University Policies and Guidelines

(1) The King IV Report (2016: 16) in defining policy states: “Policy gives effect to strategy and strategic direction by defining the frameworks, standards and plans that establish the scope or spheres within which judgment is exercised, decisions are made and actions taken”.

(2) The Committee noted that following the restructuring of Makerere University governance and management structures from a Faculty-Based Model to a Collegiate System, the Change Management Committee, oversaw the development of key institutional manuals: the Financial Procedures Manual, the Procurement Manual and the Audit Manual in addition to the Organizational Manual and Research Manual earlier developed by the URAFR Committee. The Change Management Committee further spearheaded the process of updating all policies to support the obtaining reforms. Over 40 policies were approved by the University Council on 18th December 2014. This is commended.

(3) The Committee however observed that dissemination of policies is not meticulously attended to; the University developed a digital portal for policies (http://policies.mak.ac.ug). However, this portal does not have the most updated policies, and as such may mislead the University Community consuming the outdated policies.

(4) Further, in revising the policies, the University omitted the linkages with the already existing policies on similar subject, the existing legal and regulatory framework. Policies are neither linked to previous related policies nor to the laws and regulations under which they are made.

3.7 RECOMMENDATIONS ON GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

3.7.1 Higher Education Strategy

(1) The Committee recognises that sound governance and management structures are derived from the institution’s well-articulated strategy. Higher education in Uganda needs a clear strategy pointing out what needs to be achieved as a nation. When this is established we can then find an answer to the question of how we accomplish the mission in terms of structures, systems/technology, skills, human resource, funding, etc.

(2) The initiative taken by the Ministry of Education and Sports to review the Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 is long overdue and should be fast-tracked to pave way for the development of a successor Strategic Plan. The Nation should seize this moment and through a comprehensive consultative process develop a Higher Education Strategic Plan.

(3) The review process should be informed by the relationship between the national manpower requirements, the global and continental developments, the national development agenda (Vision 2040 & NDP II), and relevance of higher education programmes.

(4) The successor Strategic Plan should then inform public policy on higher education at Government level. All universities should derive their own strategic plans from this national plan. The Institutions would then work together in collaboration to contribute to a unified national higher education agenda while placing emphasis on leveraging the specific potential for competitiveness.
(5) The contribution of each public university to this national plan should be measurable and monitored.

3.7.2 The Principal Act – UOTIA 2001 as amended

The Committee is in agreement with previous Committees that Act requires to be amended, and has provided through this Report key areas that require amendment. The Committee also recommends a thorough editorial review of the Act, to ensure correct grammar and spelling in all provisions.

3.7.3 Regulations for Operationalisation of UOTIA 2001, as amended

The Committee recommends that the NCHE enacts **Statutory Instruments** to provide for:

1. ethical standards for the members of the university.
2. the formulation and maintenance of University policies.
3. the participation of Student and Staff Unions and Associations in University governance.
4. the formation of Constituent Colleges.
5. the formation of affiliations.
6. for visitations by the NCHE.
7. Statutory Instruments providing a framework for the experience, qualifications and soft skills for eligibility for positions on the NCHE, University Councils, Vice Chancellors and other top Executives as well as Principals, Deans, Heads of Departments and Academic Staff should be enacted.

3.7.4 Visitations by the Visitor

The Committee recommends that Section 26 of the Law should be amended to provide that the Visitor handles the visitations through the Line Minister for supervisory, oversight and implementation instead of the Chancellor as stated in the Law.

3.7.5 The Line Ministry

1. The Committee recommends that for improvement in service delivery, Government should restructure the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation into the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (MoHESTI).

   a) Provide supervisory oversight to all universities and other tertiary institutions.
   b) Appoint, supervise, discipline and remove Members of the NCHE including the Chairperson and Executive Director.
   c) Appoint, discipline and remove Members of Council.
   d) Appoint and remove the Vice Chancellors of public universities on recommendation of University Council.

3.7.6 The National Council for Higher Education

1. The size of the NCHE should be informed by the required competencies for a regulatory body at this level. In any case, for best practice in governance, the size should not exceed 13 members including the Chairperson.

   a) The Members of the NCHE must be highly accomplished men and women with a wide range of experience in various fields to handle critical higher education issues
not based on representation of constituencies. Areas of expertise may include higher education management, governance, law, finance, curriculum development, amongst others.

(3) The Members of the NCHE should be appointed by the Line Minister with powers to supervise, discipline and remove Members of the NCHE.

(4) An open call for specialised members or nominations should be encouraged to ensure merit-based composition which promotes efficiency and independence.

(5) The Executive Director should be appointed by the Minister on recommendation of the NCHE.

(6) The composition of the NCHE should be reviewed to exclude staff (including Vice Chancellors) and students of Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions in Uganda. Staff and Students can be co-opted to provide domain-specific insight on the various Committees of the NCHE.

(7) The NCHE should develop regulations operationalising the Principal Act on matters such as protocol for:
   a) visitations by the NCHE to universities and other tertiary institutions.
   b) ethical standards for members of the University.
   c) formulation of policies.
   d) staff and student associations.
   e) the minimum requirements and standards for formation of constituent colleges’ offshore campuses and affiliated institutions for public universities and other tertiary institutions.

(8) The NCHE should develop and operationalise a sustainable funding model to smoothly run its operations.

(9) The NCHE should develop and gazette a Governance Charter approved by the Line Minister, prescribing:
   a) the competence-based membership structure.
   b) code of ethics of members (addressing the imperatives associated with integrity, competence, responsibility, accountability, fairness and transparency).
   c) composition of NCHE Committees.
   d) rule of order and procedure for NCHE and Committee meetings: a customised version of the modern rules of order, which were adapted from Robert’s rules of order is highly recommended.
   e) annual performance evaluation of NCHE members.
   f) emoluments of NCHE members.

3.7.7 The Chancellor of a Public University

(1) The Committee is in agreement with the recommendation of the Omaswa Task Force that the Chancellor of a Public University should be ceremonial in line with Section 30 (1), (2), & (3), of the Law, and should be held by a celebrated Academician or other person of high standing in society.
(2) The NCHE should provide Regulations for the person specifications of individuals eligible for the position of Chancellor of a Public University.

(3) The Committee recommends that the appointment of University Executives should not be part of the responsibilities of the Chancellor. The Line Minister should appoint, discipline and remove Council Members and the Vice Chancellor, while all other University Executives, Principals, Deans, Directors and Heads of Departments should be appointed by the University Council as with the remit to discipline and remove the officers accordingly.

3.7.8 Admission to a Public University

There is need to clearly define the structural relationship between PUJAB and the Admission Board at Makerere University, a Committee of Senate and the Admissions Committee provided for under Section 28 (3) & (4) of the UOTIA, 2001 as amended.

3.7.9 The Council of a Public University

3.7.9.1 Composition of the Council of a Public University

To support the formulation of the relevant standing committees, the University Council should be composed of fifteen (15) members. nine (9) independent members (from outside the University with knowledge, competencies and experience in key areas of higher education governance), a representative of the Makerere University Convocation, the Vice Chancellor as an ex-officio, one representative of academic staff as an ex-officio, one representative of non-teaching staff as an ex-officio, one representative of graduate students as an ex-officio, and one representative of undergraduate students as an ex-officio.

(1) The membership to Council should be based on competencies required for Council Business in line with the Standing Committees proposed in Table 3.7.9.4, and not on representation of constituencies. The constituency representation model of University governance (both Council and Senate) should be replaced with competence-based membership. The competencies required should not be in the Principal Act, but in the University Council and Senate Charters to enable the University to respond to the dynamics imposed to it by adopting strategies for competitiveness from time to time.

(2) The Members of the University Council must be highly accomplished men and women with a wide range of experience to handle complex higher education issues.

(3) Staff and Students can be co-opted to provide domain-specific insight on the several Committees of Council, as and when required.

(4) There should be elaborate criteria for nomination of independent members.

3.7.9.2 The Council should develop and gazette a Governance Charter (made with the approval of NCHE and the Line Minister) detailing among others, the composition, Committee structure, Committees’ terms of reference and membership, conduct of business, code of ethics of members, performance review, among others. The Governance Charter should be gazetted after approvals from the NCHE and the Line Minister. The Governance Charter should clearly layout how Governance Structures at College relate to Council.

3.7.9.3 The Council should produce annual reports submitted to the Line Minister regarding the activities being undertaken by the University.
3.7.9.4 Standing Committees of the Council of a Public University

The size of the University Council should be just about sufficient to enable formulation of the relevant Standing Committees of Council. The Committee recommends as follows:

(1) University Council should be made up of 6 standing Committees and one joint Committee with senate. The Committees would include:
   a) The Committee on Audit and Enterprise Risk Management
   b) The Committee on Finance and Investment
   c) The Committee on Student Affairs
   d) The Committee on Human Resource Management
   e) The Committee on Estate Management
   f) The Committee on Nominations
   g) The Council-Senate Joint Committee on Academics

(2) The 6 University Council Standing Committees and Council-Senate Joint Committee should each have 2 Council Members implying a total of 14 members as a minimum requirement for formulation of Committees, excluding the Council Chairperson. The Council should therefore be comprised of 15 members. The Chairperson should not be a member of any Committee of Council.

(3) Each Standing Committee should have a membership of 9, with 2 Council members providing the Chair and Deputy Chair, the rest should be co-opted. Co-opted members are individuals who are appointed as members of the Committee in order to provide skills, experience or expertise that are relevant to the Committee. The University Secretary shall provide a secretariat for each of the Committees as mandated by the Law.

3.7.9.5 The Role of the University Secretary

(1) Considering the roles of the University Secretary provided for under the UOTIA 2001 as amended, (Section 33), the Committee recommends that the role of the University Secretary should be redefined to exclude the roles and duties of Accounting Officer.

(2) The re-defined University Secretary should therefore be the Director Legal (who should be qualified to be an administrator and company secretary) and Secretary to the University Council.

(3) The University Secretary (Director Legal and Secretary to University Council) should report directly to the Vice Chancellor.

(4) The Directorate of Legal should be staffed with qualified, competent and experienced officers to support the Office of the University Secretary in its role as Secretary to Council and Corporation Secretary.
Table 3.7.9.4: Proposed Standing Committees of a Council of a Public University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standing Committees</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Committee on Audit and Enterprise Risk Management</td>
<td>The Committee provides independent assurance, advice and assistance to the Council on the University's risk, control, compliance, internal audit and governance framework, and its external accountability responsibilities including in relation to financial statements. The Committee should operate under a charter, as approved by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Committee on Finance and Investment</td>
<td>The Committee on Finance &amp; Investment gives assurance to the Council on the suitability and appropriateness of the University’s financial strategy and policies within the context of the University’s overall objectives and strategy as set by Council. This includes: i) reviewing financial plans and budgets; ii) monitoring financial performance against budget; iii) reviewing funding, banking and other financing arrangements; iv) approval of capital projects and other major commitments. The Committee is also mandated to govern, manage and regulate the investments of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Committee on Human Resource Management</td>
<td>The Human Resources Committee is mandated to: oversee the University’s compensation and benefits policies; Evaluate executive officer performance and review the University’s management succession plan; Oversee and set compensation for staff; determine the terms of employment for staff; and have oversight for staff welfare, discipline, recruitment, development, performance and exit management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Committee on Estate Management</td>
<td>Subject to any general or particular direction that may from time to time be given by the Council, the Committee on Estates Management Committee charged by Council: To ensure appropriate governance and management of estates issues across the entire academic and student accommodation estate, including asset management, capital projects, maintenance and repair, facilities management and energy and environmental issues relating to the estate; To provide oversight and institutional strategic alignment to the development and ongoing review of the University Estates Strategy and sign off any amendments or new strategies prior to submission to Council for approval; To consider and approve capital works programmes; To review business cases for all capital projects and provide advice and recommendations to the Committee on Finance &amp; Investment; To approve the principles for the allocation and use of space and resolve any conflicting priorities; and To consider and approve proposals for the naming of the University’s buildings &amp; structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Committee on Nominations</td>
<td>The Committee on Nominations is mandated to consider the strategic relevance of council structure, succession planning for council members and the filling of vacancies for appointed members of Council and to make recommendations to Council for consideration and forwarding to the Line Minister for Appointment thereon, in accordance with the provisions of the relevant Statutes and Regulations. The Committee is also responsible for reviewing the term of service of council members and effecting annual council members’ performance assessment. The Committee is also responsible for induction of council members and ensuring that the relevant council member development programmes are in place &amp; implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Committee on Student Affairs</td>
<td>The Committee contributes to the development of and advises the council on institutional strategy in relation to the student experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Council-Senate Joint Committee on Academics</td>
<td>The Council-Senate Joint Committee on Academics is mandated to consider and advise the Council upon all academic matters and questions affecting the educational policy of the University, award of honorary degrees, the organisations of teaching, examining, research, and courses of instruction, research &amp; innovation governance, and matters concerning academic co-operation between the University and other entities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.9.6 Functions and Powers of the Council of a Public University

The following are the proposed functions of the University Council:

(1) **Strategic Planning and Oversight**: The University Council should ensure institutional sustainability by working with the Executive to set the University’s Mission and Strategy. This should be in consultation with the Line Minister. The University Council is thereby responsible for assuring that appropriate steps are taken to implement the approved strategic plan and that there are effective systems of control and risk management.

(2) **Formulation of University Policies, Guidelines and Statutes under the Principal Act**: The University Council is responsible for all decisions that have significant reputational and financial implications including significant partnerships or collaborations. The Council must therefore seek assurance that the institution meets all prescribed legal and regulatory requirements imposed on it as a body corporate, by formulating the relevant instruments of governance such as statutes, polices and guidelines.

(3) **Appointment of University Executives, Principals, Deans and Directors**: The University Council should appoint the University Executives (Other than the VC), Principals, Deans and Directors through an open and competitive process. The University Council should after an open and competitive process, recommend for appointment of a Vice Chancellor to the Line Minister.

(4) **Approval of the University’s Annual Work Plans and Budget, and Mobilisation of Resources for the University**

(5) **Employer of all University Staff (Academic, Administrative, Project/Research and Support)**: The University Council is responsible for adequate staffing of the University, setting Staff salaries & allowances, Staff development, performance, benefits, welfare and discipline.

(6) **Establishment of the University’s Governance and Management Structures, Systems and Processes** and ensuring that they are fit for purpose by referencing them against recognised standards of good practice. In this role the University Council is responsible for establishing Colleges, Schools, Departments, Research Centres, Institutes, related Governance Bodies, and other structures relevant for the efficient and effective governance and management of the University.

(7) **Succession Planning for University Council**: The University Council is responsible for succession planning for the Members of Council.

(8) **Administrator of University Physical and Intellectual Property**.

(9) Undertake other functions set out in the University Council’s Gazetted Charter.

The Committee proposes the following **Powers of the University Council**:

(1) Subject to the provisions of the Principal Act, to make Statutes, Regulations, and Policies.

(2) To co-opt competent and reputable individuals within and outside of the University to the Committees of Council.

(3) To appoint University Executives (Excluding the VC), Principals, Deans, and Directors.
(4) To authorise, on the recommendation of the Senate, the creation of academic programmes and posts in the University.

(5) To set up or to dissolve special Committees to study matters of specific interest to the University.

(6) To grant, after report from the Senate, the title of Emeritus Professor.

(7) To determine the conditions of appointment of all Staff of the University.

(8) To set all Staff salaries and allowances

(9) To determine all University fees in consultation with Senate and the Line Minister.

(10) To institute fellowships, scholarships, studentships, prizes, exhibitions and bursaries and other aids to study and research.

(11) To govern, manage and regulate the finances, accounts, investments, property, business and all affairs whatsoever of the University, and for that purpose to appoint Bankers and any other officers or agents whom it may seem expedient to appoint, provided that before determining any question of finance which directly affects the educational policy of the University the Council shall take into consideration any recommendation or report by the Senate.

(12) To invest any moneys belonging to the University in such stocks, funds, fully paid shares or securities as the Council shall from time to time think fit, whether within Uganda or not, or in the purchase of freehold or leasehold hereditaments in Uganda including rents, provided that in the case of moneys held by the University as trustee, the powers conferred in this paragraph shall be exercised subject to the provisions of the law relating to investment by trustees.

(13) To sell, buy, exchange, lease and accept leases of Physical and Intellectual Property on behalf of the University.

(14) To provide and maintain the buildings, premises, furniture and apparatus and other means necessary for carrying out the work of the University.

(15) To provide for the welfare of all persons in the employment of the University or formerly in the employment of the University.

(16) To establish Committees including representatives of the Students and representatives of the Council and such other persons as the Council may determine and to prescribe the method of appointment of such representatives and the functions of such Committees.

(17) To select a Seal and a Mace for the University and to have the sole custody and use of the Seal.

(18) To regulate and superintend the conduct of the Students of the University, and to determine the manner in which disciplinary powers shall be exercised.

(19) To regulate Student and Staff associations

3.7.9.7 Conduct of Business/Meetings of Council

To cultivate a culture of holding effective adequately pre-planned meetings, the following measures are recommended:

(1) Meetings should be conclusively focused on strategic reports and delegated items.
(2) The Council should explore the use of current generation technology for communication thereby saving time.

(3) Statutory meetings should be organised along a pre-determined cyclical pattern built into the annual calendar. For example, it would be ideal for the first quarter meeting to be heavy-laden on previous year’s financial statements, audit and compliances, the two intermediate meetings can concentrate on strategy implementation while the last meeting would consider performance reviews, strategy review and succession matters.

(4) It is also recommended that the University Council should adopt a practice of post-meeting evaluation for each statutory meeting.

3.7.9.8 Induction of New Council Members

It is imperative that Council Members are duly sensitised of their fiduciary duties which require them to individually act in good faith and for proper purposes consistent with the objects and interests of the University through a well conceptualised induction and development programme.

3.7.9.9 Membership Term

The Committee recommends that:

(1) the Act should be amended to include a limitation clause on membership for a 4 years term renewable only once.

(2) members whose service exceeds 8 years should be retired from Council. This will create space for new entrants into a restructured University Council.

(3) for preservation of institutional knowledge, all Council members should not be replaced at once. There should be a plan to replace 5-10 members every cycle, retaining 5 to provide institution memory.

3.7.9.10 Emoluments of Council Members

The Committee in line with good governance recommends that to avoid conflict of interest, members of the Governing body should not receive remuneration but may be entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable traveling, accommodation and other expenses incurred in traveling to or from attending meetings of the Council. The payment of retainers to Council members should be abolished.

3.7.9.11 Evaluation of Council Performance

Good governance requires the University Council to ensure accountability and transparency by instituting a streamlined regular process typically annual of evaluation of its own performance and its Committees, its chairperson and individual members, to support progressive enhancement in its performance and effectiveness.

The Committee recommends as follows:

(1) The University Council should assume the responsibility of its own performance and that of its Chairperson and individual members by determining how it should be approached and conducted.

(2) The NCHE should develop regulations to be followed in the annual evaluation of the performance of the University Council, with clear remedial actions to be taken in light of the performance results.
3.7.9.10 Discipline and Removal of Council Members

The Governance Charter should provide detailed circumstances that constitute misconduct by a Council member and the resultant action on such a member. The Line Minister should be responsible for appointment, discipline and removal of University Council Members.

3.7.10 The Senate of a Public University

1. The Committee recommends that the composition and membership of Senate should be the remit of the University Council.

2. The Principal Act should not prescribe the functions and composition of Senate. This should be done by the University Council through a Senate Charter or Handbook, in tune with the University’s Strategic Plan from which the relevant internal governance and management structures are derived and given effect.

3. These internal governance and management structures should be part of the Gazetted Governance Charter of the Specific University.

4. The Committee recommends that the Act is accordingly amended to take these recommendations into account.

3.7.11 Makerere University Central Administration

The Committee recognizes that the pursuit of excellence and relevance in the Uganda higher education ecosystem rests in the caliber/nature of leaders in place for strategic direction, supervision, monitoring and evaluation at all level. The University’s governance and management structures should be attendant to clear lines of authority derived from the prescribed institutional strategy and the associated legal and regulatory framework. These structures should not be static but dynamic, periodically reviewed and implemented to address the strategic direction of the Institution.

3.7.11.1 The Vice Chancellor

The Committee recommends as follows in line with best practices for good governance:

1. The Vice Chancellor of a Public University should be appointed by the Line Minister on recommendation of the University Council through an open and competitive process excluding elections. The Line Minister should be the Government officer charged with the responsibility for discipline or removal of a Vice Chancellor. The University Council should annually evaluate the performance of the Vice Chancellor against a performance agreement.

2. The Vice Chancellor should be responsible for leading the implementation and execution of approved strategy, policy and operational planning, and should serve as the Chief link between Management and the University Council.

3. The Vice Chancellor should be the Chief Executive and Accounting Officer of a Public University.

4. The Vice Chancellor should be accountable and report to the University Council. The University Council should be responsible for supervising and disciplining the Vice Chancellor.

5. The Vice Chancellor should be an ex-officio member (without voting powers) of the University Council.

6. The Vice Chancellor should not be a member of the Committee on Human Resource Management; Committee on Audit and Risk Management; and Committee on
Nominations, but should attend by invitation any meeting, or part thereof, if needed to contribute pertinent insights and information.

(7) Ex-Vice Chancellors should not be Members of the University Council at their former Institution in any capacity

(8) The Vice Chancellor should be adequately inducted into Office and undergo higher education governance and management training as part of the induction process.

(9) The process of recruiting the Vice Chancellor should always start at least 12 months before the end of the term of the seating Vice Chancellor to provide for proper handover, induction and institutional continuity and stability.

(10) The profile and person specifications of the Vice Chancellor should be provided in the Gazetted Governance Charter of the University.

3.7.11.2 Top Management Team

The Committee recommends that the Gazetted University Governance Charter should provide the detailed governance and management structures of the University relevant for realizing the approved strategy. This should account for all levels of governance and management from the University Council to Central Administration, Senate, Colleges, Schools and Departments in the case of a University like Makerere which is based on the collegiate system. The composition of the Management Team of the University should be derived from the desired functions and powers of the Management Team, and should be carefully considered to avoid undue duplication of membership with Senate.

The Committee further recommends that the UOTIA, 2001 as amended, should not prescribe positions for the officers other than the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and University Secretary. Considering the fact that all Public Universities are not the same and have unique strategies and therefore should have fit for purpose governance and management structures, the organizational structure of each University should be uniquely derived as the optimal structure needed to realize its approved strategy by the University Council and included in the gazetted University Governance Charter.

3.7.11.3 The Deputy Vice Chancellors

The Committee recommends that:

(1) the University Council in formulating the organisational structure for approval by the NCHE and Minister should justify the need for the proposed number of DVCs by linking them directly to how the number of DVCs will enhance the realisation of the University’s Strategy and the capacity to sustain the employment of these DVCs and obtaining structures.

(2) the appointed DVCs should report to the Vice Chancellor who they deputise and work professionally under his/her leadership to implement and execute approved strategy, policy and contribute to operational planning.

(3) where more than one DVC is required and appointed, there should be very clear segregation of duties and responsibilities for smooth execution of the prescribed mandate.

3.7.12 Recommendations on the Makerere University Collegiate System

(1) There is need to define the necessary staffing based on the size of a College in terms of Programmes, Staff and Students.
(2) The role of the Deputy Principals needs to be reviewed alongside that of School Deans. Similarly, the College administrative staffing should be reviewed so as not to increase administrative overhead, but be based on clear measurement of work to determine what the College needs to run.

(3) Colleges should be given the autonomy to manage their affairs with the Centre providing a supervisory and oversight role on crosscutting systems. Makerere University should fully operationalise the College system by devolving to the Colleges more administrative and financial powers, functions and responsibilities. This will reduce red tape and empower Colleges to make strategic decisions related to their respective mandates. The operationalisation could be informed by the College System at the University of Oxford, University of London, and University of Dar es Salaam.

(4) The relationship between Mulago Hospital and Makerere University should be streamlined with a well conceptualised MoU to ensure that Makerere University benefits from the services rendered to the Hospital.

(5) The initiative to restructure and align the Central Administrative Units to the Collegiate System should be completed.

(6) The following Colleges should be disaggregated into two:
   a) the College of Humanities and Social Sciences into the College of Humanities and the College of Social Sciences.
   b) the College of Health Sciences into the College of Medicine and College of Public Health.

(7) To decongest the Main Campus and focus on Graduate Training and Research, Makerere University should explore the following:
   a) Relocate CAES to Kabanyolo,
   b) The undergraduate programmes at CEES should be transferred and consolidated at Kyambogo, which is historically the premium Institution for pedagogical sciences. This should enable CEES to focus on graduate training and research.
   c) The undergraduate programmes at COBAMS should be transferred and consolidated at MUBS, an institution affiliated to Makerere University focusing on Business Studies. This should enable COBAMS to focus on graduate training and research in Business Studies.
   d) The undergraduate programmes at CHUSS should be transferred and consolidated at Nsamizi Training Institute of Social Development. This should enable CHUSS to focus on graduate training and research.

(8) The issue of very small Colleges (Law) also requires to be studied carefully to clarify what structures should be in place to facilitate their growth. It is appreciated that indeed the School of Law offers a unique discipline which may not organically fit in any other College but it is equally important to have these Colleges with optimised governance and management structures attendant to their footprint in the University’s ecosystem.

The Committee recommends that for better resource utilisation, the School of Law should explore working within the structures of the College of Business and Management Sciences which could be rebranded College of Law and Business.
(9) Considering the restructuring of the University to a collegiate system, the notion of Off-Shore Campuses should be revisited with a view of establishing Constituent Colleges.

3.7.13 Makerere University Policies and Guidelines

There is need for a clear structure for policy documents including linkages to previous policies and obtaining laws and regulations with express statement of the obtaining relationship(s). Best practices indicated that policies are structured in such a way that they conspicuously provide for the policy name, approval authority, responsible executive, responsible office, date of original issue, dates of earlier revisions, policy statement, reason for policy, who should read the policy, related documents, and contacts in case of information about the policy. This well organised structure makes it easy for users of the information.

It is therefore recommended that Makerere University adopts a comprehensive policy structure and traceability system, and accordingly updates the online policy portal.

3.7.14 Makerere University as a National Public University System

Makerere University is a household name on the regional and international scene. Indeed it has trained great leaders in the region and all public and private universities in Uganda are manned by products of Makerere University. For it to renew its past glory while weaning off new younger universities, the Makerere Brand should be optimally utilised to give confidence in the new regional public universities that are being established and also as a way of doing away with duplication of programmes, premature specialisations and decongesting Makerere University Main Campus.

The Government should leverage the premier brand of Makerere University to restructure the public universities into a National Public University System similar to the Indian Institute of Technology, University of Malaysia, Monash University in Australia, University of Michigan, University of California, or University of London Systems (The University which gave birth to Makerere University College). This would progressively transform Constituent Colleges established upcountry into upcountry branches of Makerere University. For example, Muni University would become Makerere University Muni; Busitema University would become Makerere University Busitema.

3.7.15 Setup an Independent Task Force

In view of the fact that the University is grappling with deficiencies in governance and management, it is recommended that a Makerere University Independent Transformation Task Force (MUTTF) be set up by Government for a period of three (3) to five (5) years. Specifically the Taskforce shall:

(1) Develop a twenty (20) years’ comprehensive Operational Viability Analysis (OVA) [strategic goals, strategy, governance and management structures, legal framework, required resources, job analysis, cost structures, and revenue streams]

(2) Develop an Implementation Plan for Makerere University Reforms, and

(3) Provide strategic oversight for its implementation including the recommendations of the Rwendeire Committee.

The taskforce should be composed of up to seven (7) members with competences in corporate governance, legal, finance, strategic planning, human resource management, ICT and higher education curriculum development. The taskforce should be housed in the Ministry responsible for higher education.
CHAPTER FOUR: HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Over the years, efforts to mitigate strikes frequently ended in unfortunate stalemates with Staff demanding pay enhancements and payment of incentive arrears, especially post 2013. The increasing propensity of Staff strikes with a concomitant student dissension to escalate into demonstrations causes immense socio-economic disruptions in Government programmes, besides causing public anxiety among the key stakeholders including but not limited to parents and sponsors, development partners, the business community in the neighborhood of Makerere University Main Campus, and the public at large.

The Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 asserts that Ugandans expect education, particularly higher education, to provide the skills to develop science, technology and research capacity to bring about national prosperity and harmony. It further states that the possession of skilled human resources that have the capacity to produce, select, adapt, commercialise and use knowledge for development determines the wealth or poverty of nations. Economic growth is now as much a process of knowledge acquisition as of capital accumulation, and thus higher education must empower Ugandans to cope with global socio-economic forces and operate in the new competitive global and regional environment effectively. The core functions of Makerere University as prescribed in her Strategic Plan 2008/09-2018/19 are: Teaching & Learning; Research & Innovations; and Knowledge transfer Partnerships and networking. The University should be buttressed by functional institutional structures, systems, engaged skilled Staff, appropriate leadership styles and shared values to efficiently and effectively realise the goals prescribed against the core functions.

Qualified, skilled, satisfied, highly-motivated and loyal employees represent the basis for competitiveness of an organisation. The growth of satisfaction is to be reflected in the increase of productivity; improvement of the quality of products and services, and higher number of innovations. Satisfied employees form positive reference to the employer and thus increase its attractiveness for potential job seekers and strengthen its competitive position in the marketplace. This Report presents a detailed analysis of the human resource management imperatives at Makerere University drawing on work by previous Committees and best practices elsewhere to derive plausible interventions for employee satisfaction and engagement at Makerere University.

4.2 HR IMPERATIVES IN STRATEGIC PLANS

4.2.1 Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015

This Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 was structured around six themes: Higher Education Curriculum Reform; Increasing ICT Capacity; Increasing Access, Equity and Coverage; Delivery of Quality Higher Education; Financing Higher Education; and Improving Governance of Higher Education. The key aspects of Human Resource Management were covered in thematic areas 4 and 6: Delivery of Quality Higher Education and Improving Governance of Higher Education, respectively.

The Higher Education Strategic Plan emphasises that the quality of a tertiary institution depends on the quality of its Academic Staff. Members of Academic Staff are the pillars of quality in higher education provision. To attract, train and retain good Academic Staff, tertiary education institutions would be required to:

(1) Institute a salary package commensurate with the Staff training and skills.
(2) Establish and enforce appropriate Staff Student ratios.
(3) Establish transparent hiring, promotion and firing procedures.
(4) Establish minimum qualification requirements in universities and other tertiary institutions.
(5) Put in place clear transparent procedure guidelines for selecting Staff development beneficiaries and funding priorities.

4.2.2 Makerere University Strategic Plan 2008/09-2018/19

It is noted in the Makerere University Strategic Plan 2008/09-2018/19 that in the current knowledge era, human resources are the prime movers of any institution, particularly a University. Staff recruitment and retention will play a critical role in the fulfilment of Makerere University’s mission. The human resource function will be managed strategically in line with the University focus on learner-centredness, research-driven and knowledge transfer partnerships. The goal of Human Resource Management is to ensure Makerere University’s competitiveness in recruiting and retention of high quality human resource. To this end, Makerere University devised the following strategies:

(1) Develop and operationalise competitive and effective HR policies.
(2) Comply with standards as specified by National Council for Higher Education and international standards.
(3) Assess and strengthen the human resource, knowledge competences and skills.
(4) Nurture an environment for positive work culture to achieve optimum performance.
(5) Institute Academic Staff Member Raising Scheme (ASMRS) among graduate students.
(6) Design and operationalise a Medical Insurance Scheme for Staff.

From the above, the University appreciates the central role of competitive, satisfied and engaged employees in the timely accomplishment of the obtaining objectives. Pursuant to this, the relevant strategies aimed at addressing higher education and Makerere University’s Human Resource Management requirements were crafted.

4.3 RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS COMMITTEES

4.3.1 McGregor Visitation Committee to Public Universities 2006-2007

His Excellency Yoweri Kaguta Museveni the President of the Republic of Uganda in His capacity as the Visitor to Public Universities appointed a 12 Member Visitation Committee to Public Universities in March 2006, chaired by Professor Gordon P. McGregor. The McGregor Committee was set up to visit, study and make a situational analysis of Public Universities in Uganda (Makerere University, MUST, Kyambogo University and Gulu University); and make recommendations in respect of Administrative Affairs, Academic Affairs, Funding, Student Management and Public Private Sector Partnership. The McGregor Report was submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports in August 2007. This was followed by an associated White Paper in November 2008. The following are the recommendations related to Human Resource Management and the associated Government position as well as implementation strategies for each proposal:
4.3.1.1 Organizational Structure

Recommendation I: There is notably at Makerere a lack of clarity in the conflicting powers exercised by the senior administrators. Councils and Senates should undertake urgent and full reviews of their own responsibilities and those of the universities’ top administrators.

Government Position: Sections of the UOTIA Act 2001 should be amended to provide for the Academic Registrar and University Secretary to be responsible to the Vice Chancellor through the relevant Deputy Vice Chancellors and that the third Deputy Vice Chancellor post be made optional. While the option of phasing out the University Secretary and Academic Registrars should be examined further. The rest is carried.

Implementation Strategy: Section 30.07 of the UOTIA Act 2001 to be amended in order to review the roles and responsibilities of the various management organs in Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions.

Recommendation II: Makerere University in particular should undergo an overhaul of its administrative structure and style, including financial administration. Management training and in training are urgently required. In particular, the management of IGF from private pool at Makerere University should be investigated by a respective firm of auditors/accountants.

Government Position: Recommendations were accepted:

Implementation Strategy: A thorough audit which will inform the restructuring process will be carried out immediately.

Recommendation III: The Visitation Committee is of the view that no supervisory role over the affairs of public universities should be vested in the Visitor. The Act should be amended and the role of the Visitor would be limited to visitations and advice, the results of which should be used to inform major improvements in the public university system.

Government Position: The recommendation was not accepted. The visitor shall perform an overall supervisory role over the affairs of each public university as provided for under sub-section (2) of section (26) of the UOTIA 2001, as amended.

4.3.1.2 Terms of Employment

Recommendation: Owing to the shortage of senior Academic Staff, we recommend that Government should revise the retirement age of Academic Staff to 70 years and Council should be at liberty to give contract beyond statutory age.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted with the following addition: “Universities Councils should be at liberty to give contract beyond statutory age.”

Implementation Strategy: Staff development strategies will be enhanced to allow for academic growth.

4.3.1.3 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

Recommendation: Universities should create efficient and reliable management information system to keep all stakeholders and data processing and retention be drastically improved. Staff including senior staff should be provided with ICT Training and to ensure effective planning and management, all University officials should be trained in the collection, storage and dissemination of data.

Government Position: Recommendation is accepted with an addition that Universities collect and utilise data.
Implementation Strategy: All Universities will be required to start ICT training programmes for staff. E-learning will be introduced and staff trained accordingly. The communication channel, such as the Makerere University web page will be upgraded and utilised by administrators to ease communication. The new Ministry of ICT should support institution efforts.

4.3.1.4 Job Analysis

Recommendations: Councils and senior management should make every effort to heal sharp antagonisms between academics and administrators through open discussion of major problems, followed by careful advice. Clear divisions of responsibility should achieve better cooperation.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: Appointment procedures, personnel job specifications, roles and responsibilities will be reviewed with immediate effect.

4.3.1.5 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

Recommendations I: To improve the current elective systems of officials and top academics which have been prescribed by Law, public universities should consider a system which combines the search team approach and its election approach. In such a system the electorate would vote for a candidate they want from a list of names presented by a Search Team.

Government Position: Recommendation was amended as follows: Posts for officials and top academics will be advertised instead of the current elective systems and the proposed search team approach, the Council will present the Chancellor with two names from which to appoint a Vice Chancellor.

Implementation Strategy: Recommendation as amended will be implemented in a short term.

Recommendation II: All appointments of part-time staff should be made according to Council approved procedures, and be approved and recorded by Central Administration.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: It will be implemented immediately.

4.3.1.6 Performance Managements and Staff Development

Recommendations I: Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performances. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible rewarded but poor performers should not be re-appointed. Terms of employment in public universities should change from permanent to pensionable to contracts of limited durations; say 3-5 years renewable on good performance.

Government Position: Recommendation was amended as follows: Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performances. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible rewarded but poor performers should not be re-appointed. Academic staff in public Universities will be maintained on permanent and pensionable terms and appropriate criteria for their promotion will be put in place.

Implementation Strategy: Universities will be required to immediately review the human resource manual and implement the recommendation within short term of (1-2) years.
Recommendation II: Staff appraisal system should be universal, regular and effective with feedback. Students should be involved in the appraisal and assessment of academic staff and should have a right appeal against academic assessment.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: It will be implemented immediately and Government will require all Universities to develop and implement appraisal systems. Students and fellow staff will be part of the appraisal processes.

4.3.1.7 Benefits and Allowances

Recommendation I: Councils and Vice Chancellors should review their Senates functions and structures to ensure Senates’ responsibilities for the academic work and quality of education are carried out efficiently and with integrity. The members of Councils and Senates should be fully committed to, and informed about their responsibilities and the detailed structures and functions of their Universities. Currently, in some universities allowances and retainer fees are unreasonably high. The attendance allowance and retainer fees of Council Members be reviewed to address the current unreasonably high allowances and retainer fees.

Government Position: Recommendation is accepted.

Implementation Strategy: University Councils and Vice Chancellors will be required to implement the recommendation with immediate effect according to the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (UOTIA) 2001.

Recommendation II: The present system or culture/practice of paying wide ranging “Allowances” should be reviewed and drastically reduced. Universities should not pay allowances for duties which form part of staff contract responsibilities of an employee during normal working days” including meetings.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: University Councils will immediately review the allowances and implement the recommendation immediately.

4.3.1.8 Motivation, Engagement, Commitment and Culture

Recommendation: Management needs to greatly improve the professional commitment to basic obligations such as regular attendance, punctuality, meeting deadlines and doing a full day’s work. We believe that honest staff appraisal procedures, supported by improvements in working conditions and facilities could quickly begin to restore the staff morale and cure widespread distrust and disenchantment.

Government Position: Recommendation was accepted with adjustment to bring out staff appeal besides students appeal. Systems will be put in place to ensure professional commitment by staff to basic obligations such as regular attendance, punctuality, meeting deadlines and doing full day’s work.

Implementation Strategy: Regular appraisal will be mandatory and resource mobilisation will be diversified. Terms and conditions of service will be streamlined across all Public Universities.

4.3.2 Omaswa Taskforce 2011-2014

The Omaswa Taskforce on Job Evaluation, Re-Organisation of the Staff Structure and Financing of Makerere University was setup by Makerere University Council on behalf of Government following Makerere University staff strike over salary related issues that took place in September 2011. The Taskforce was composed of 10 notable individuals with
extensive knowledge of higher education and commitment to Makerere University including representatives of relevant Government Ministries. The Taskforce was launched on 18th November, 2011 by the Minister of Education and Sports, Hon. Jessica Alupo.

The main goal of the review was to understand the current challenges faced by Makerere University and propose solutions that will result in a well-motivated, equipped and resourced Academic, Administrative and Support University Staff who are enthusiastic about contributing to the formation and production of:

1. quality, competitive and marketable Makerere University graduates and products capable of meeting the demands of the labour markets in Uganda, the East African region and beyond;
2. dynamic, thriving and conducive academic, research and innovations environment in Makerere University; and
3. Makerere transformed into an African University of the 21st Century actively contributing to Uganda, Africa and global sustainable and equitable development.

The recommendations of the Omaswa Taskforce are presented in the sections hereunder under the appropriate HR thematic areas:
4.3.2.1 Organizational Structure

(1) **Strengthen and Streamline Administrative Support to the University Council:** The performance of the University Council is critical to the achievement of the goals and objectives of the University. It is therefore important to provide an enabling environment for the University Council to perform optimally through the provision of competent and effective administrative support. The Task Force therefore recommends that the office of Secretary to Council be held by a dedicated officer free from other administrative responsibilities and, preferably, with a legal background and housed in the Directorate of Legal Affairs reporting directly to the VC.

(2) The Task Force noted that Makerere University is a huge and complex organisation whose effective governance calls for robust structures, highly performing and accountable managers and responsive systems: The Task Force identified further areas of conflict in the existing structure. The Task Force therefore recommends that the University Council takes the necessary action to promote team work among top management. In addition, the recommended Management Consultancy to assist the University with change management should, among other things, be assigned the responsibility to develop the team leadership competences amongst the top management of the University.

(3) To effectively manage such a large and complex institution, mechanisms for regular management consultations are essential:

a) The Taskforce recommended that the VC should establish two top management organs as follows:

b) A Top Management Team comprising the VC (Chair), Deputy VCs and College Principals. This body should meet frequently, preferably, every month.

c) A Central Management Team as a larger body bringing together the VC (Chair), DVCs and Directors (Heads of various Directorates). This body should meet on a quarterly basis.

(4) **Deputy Vice Chancellors:** The current Law is clearly a source of conflict between the office of the VC and DVC (F&A) on the one hand, and that of the University Secretary (US) on the other; regarding oversight, responsibility and accountability for finances and general administration of the University. This is an anomaly that needs to be corrected by possibly merging the office of the University Secretary with that of the office of the DVC F&A.

(5) **Counseling, Guidance & Outreach Centre:** Counseling and guidance services at the University are inadequate. The Task Force recommends that a separate Directorate is established; and its services are to be used by both staff and students and which services reflect and bring together the different specialisations of Psychologists (e.g. Clinical, Counseling, Industrial/Organisational Psychologists, and Educational, etc.) The current Counseling and Guidance Centre would be one of the units in this Directorate.

(6) In light of the above, the Task Force recommended the following structures under the DVC (FA&A):

a) Directorate of Finance,
b) Directorate of Estates,
c) Directorate of HR,
d) Directorate of Health Services,
(7) The relationship between administrative positions at the Colleges and those at the Centre are ambiguous. The position of a Human Resource officer at the College is not provided for in the College Statute yet it is an essential function. The Law should allow flexibility for the University administration to define and establish Academic and Administrative positions and not prescribe all of them as is the case at present. Appropriate amendments should be made to the Act to provide this flexibility and delete the legally prescribed positions. Devolution has not been facilitated by the ambiguity in the current Law.

(8) The School of Law has expressed interest in becoming a College since it neither fits in the current College of Humanities and Social Sciences nor in any other College. The Task Force is in agreement that Law as a profession has great potential. Therefore, the School of Law should be upgraded to the status of a College. This will enable it to expand and serve the national needs of the country better. However, further dialogue between and among the legal and administrative communities in Makerere will be necessary to gain consensus on this matter.

(9) An establishment structure for Directorate of Information and Communication Technology Support (DICTS) under the Office of the Vice-Chancellor should be developed to address current challenges and filled with appropriate staff with commensurate remuneration.

4.3.2.2 Terms of Employment

(1) **NCHE Guidelines on Workload should be followed:** NCHE has specified optimal workloads for Academic Staff at all Universities in the country. The Task Force found these are not being followed in Makerere. In some Colleges there is gross under-staffing with some Departments having as low as 40% staffing levels. At the same time many academic staff are receiving additional payment per hour taught while others are not. Some of the staff teach day, evening, and weekend classes. The Task Force did not find evidence of actions being taken by Senate to address this problem.

(2) There is a large number of temporary staff and vacationers in the University. The Task Force recommends that a validation exercise be undertaken as soon as possible in order to streamline the establishment and save resources.

(3) All temporary appointments should not last beyond six months.

4.3.2.3 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

**Human Resource Information System (HURIS):** The Task Force found that the Directorate of Human Resources had a dedicated information system for HR. But this was not being utilised to support the Directorate in effectively managing HR information.

The Task Force recommended the following:

(1) the Human Resource Information System (HURIS) should be optimised to aid the processing of Staff information.

(2) the staff in the Directorate should be trained on how to use it.

(3) identification of all staff and students should be made mandatory and implemented using modern technology.

(4) the University should urgently undertake a headcount to establish the actual number, categories, and employment status of all employees of the University. The
establishment of the University should be reviewed in line with the recommendations of this Task Force.

4.3.2.4 Job Analysis

(1) **The Chancellor**

a) The post of the Chancellor should remain ceremonial and should be held by a celebrated Academic or other person of high standing in society.

b) The NCHE should provide guidelines on the person specifications of individuals qualified to occupy the office of Chancellor of a Public University.

c) The University Council should ensure that the Chancellor is provided with the requisite facilitation for the performance of roles as provided in the Act.

(2) The role of the VC in the administrative and financial management of the University should be made explicit in the Law: The Task Force recommends that the VC becomes the Accounting Officer of the University with powers to delegate to the DVC (F&A).

(3) There are many administrative staff who have acquired University degrees and other higher qualifications that are not necessarily in their line of specialization. The Task Force recommends that they all be provided with career guidance and appropriately redeployed.

(4) The University administration should immediately undertake a review of the positions of custodians with a view to filling existing vacancies.

4.3.2.5 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

(1) **The profile of a person to be appointed as the Vice-Chancellor is not provided for in the Law:** The Task Force recommends that the University Council and MOES should ensure such a profile is provided for in the Act; stating, among other things, that the VC should be: (a) an embodiment of the academic tradition of excellence and intellectual culture of the University; b) the Chief Public Relations Officer and face of the University; c) committed to the promotion of Higher Education; and (d) an acclaimed academic with extensive and demonstrable corporate managerial experience in high office.

(2) **Selection of University Officers**

a) In view of the call from the majority of the stakeholders within and outside the University, the Task Force recommended a reform of the electoral process and the amendment of the Act so that all University Officers are appointed and not elected.

b) For Makerere to remain a first rate University it should not operate a closed recruitment system; rather, it should be able to cast its net wide to recruit the very best staff in and outside Uganda.

(3) **Fast Track Promotion/New entrant Requirements for Promotion:** The Task Force was informed that Senate at its 155th meeting reviewed the policy on appointment and promotion of academic staff and decided that they could be appointed and promoted using a multi-tracking system and ordinary track with promotion based on teaching experience, research publications and supervision of students to completion.

(4) **Staff Promotions:** The Task Force learnt from various submissions of internal stakeholders that some people are overqualified for the jobs they are currently
holding. This could have been brought about by the fact that some Makerere University staff, especially the Administrative staff members; have acquired higher qualifications than required by the positions they occupy. They therefore feel demotivated and demoralised to be performing tasks below their qualifications.

(5) The Taskforce recommends that the Directorate of Human Resources should address this issue by making sure that all staff that do not fit in the structures of the University job establishment should be released. This should be done prior to the commencement of the Financial Year 2014/2015 because of its budgetary implications.

(6) There is widespread dissatisfaction among staff and other stakeholders outside the University on the policy of electing Academic leaders at the University. The TF recommends that all Academic leadership positions be filled through a competitive appointment system as determined and overseen by the University Council.

(7) Everything possible should be done to recruit and train ICT staff in the services of the University, including giving them special remuneration.

(8) During the Task Force’s consultations with internal stakeholders, it was noted that appointment of staff at College level is not yet well streamlined. For instance, it was observed that there are staff that are appointed by the Colleges and are not reported to the Centre. The Task Force recommends that all appointments at Colleges and in the entire University should strictly be within established posts. Further, a head count of all staff should be undertaken to ascertain their consistency with the establishment. The Task Force is of the view that College staff including Principals be appointed by the University Appointments Board as already recommended.

4.3.2.6 Performance Managements and Staff Development

All Academic and administrative staff should be provided with induction and ongoing training in the core functions of the University. All Academic Staff should undergo special training in teaching and learning methodology.

4.3.2.7 Grade and Pay Structure

(1) **Salary Structure - Single Spine:** The Task Force received and studied arguments for and against the single spine salary structure. In benchmarking visits it also came up that some Universities, such as the University of Nairobi that had implemented a double spine salary structure; were soon reverting to a single spine due to its complication in administration and frequent grievances raised by the non-academic Staff.

The Task Force has designed a single spine salary structure but has the capacity to accommodate the distinct nature of academic staff contribution. In the proposed structure, whereas other University Staff will commence on the minimum point, it is recommended that the academic staff commence on the 4th of any Grade. This will go a long way in addressing the complaint raised by the Academic Staff that the contribution of core staff of the University is not being recognised.

(2) **Remunerating Lecturers in Science and Clinical Fields:** The Government of Uganda recently took a decision to remunerate all Science teachers in the country with a 30% increase in the base pay. This intervention was studied along with the clinical allowance currently being paid by Makerere University. Consultations also revealed that in other Universities, a certain pay is given to Clinicians across the region essentially to recognise their unique service. In the University of Nairobi, it is called a non-practicing allowance for those in Clinical Sciences. This was also the
practice at Makerere University in the past. The Management is however not in support while the College of Health Sciences (CHS) argues strongly in favor of restoration of a Clinical Allowance to compensate for the extensive amount of time spent with students during service delivery at the Teaching Hospital and Community Outreach.

The Task Force studied the current arrangements and recommends that the current Clinical Allowance be retained and increased as follows: Professor: UGX 750,000; Assistant Professor: UGX 600,000; Senior Lecturer: UGX450,000 and Lecturer: UGX 300,000.

(3) **Headcount Anomalies:** The Task Force was not able to establish with certainty the exact number of employees in the University. However, it observed that some employees, especially cleaners whose services were outsourced were still on the University Payroll. As a result, the University is making double payments. There are also a number of temporary employees, some employed against established positions and working beyond the stipulated six months.

The Task Force recommended the following:

1. the Directorate immediately conducts an actual head count of all staff in the University with a view to clean up the Payroll.
2. the University top leadership should prioritise payment of terminal benefits for those employees whose services were outsourced.

### 4.3.2.8 Employee Relationship Management

**The Task Force noted the need to Enforce Discipline by the Appropriate Authorities in the University:** A crisis has been created by rampant dereliction of duty and indiscipline among Academic Staff including some Members of Senate. The existing disciplinary procedures are not being enforced by the University leadership as they should. The Task Force recommends that the University Council, Senate and the VC take all action necessary to restore discipline among staff at the University.

### 4.3.2.9 Benefits and Allowances

(1) **Allowances and Benefits:** The Task Force noted that Makerere University pays a number of allowances to Staff, including medical, fuel, telephone, housing, responsibility, top up and clinical for those working in the Medical School. The allowances have been perceived as a way of enhancing salaries that have been inadequate to cover the cost of living. The allowances differ from grade to grade in the current Makerere structure. With the proposed enhanced salary structure, the Task Force recommended that allowances, with the exception of responsibility allowance, and clinical allowance be pegged to the base pay and a 20% across all grades and consolidated pay. This should take effect with the commencement of the implementation of the new salary scale.

(2) **Top-up Allowance:** Top-up allowance is paid at different rates in different units of the University. Currently the amount payable in Top Up Allowance is in the region of UGX 800,000,000 monthly. As with other allowances, top up is seen as a form of salary enhancement. Unfortunately, internal consultations revealed that the inequitable manner in which top-up allowance is distributed has resulted into a major source of discontent to Makerere University Staff. It has been cited as one of the reasons Makerere University staff went on strike in 2011. It is recommended that the
University Council abolishes top-up allowance with the implementation of the Task Force recommended salary structure.

(3) **Extra Duty Allowance:** The Taskforce further recommended that the workload system be strengthened, minimum workload hours for both teaching and research staff be determined and all teaching staff be monitored. Only those that exceed the minimum workload should be paid an extra workload allowance not exceeding UGX50,000 gross pay per hour of extra workload beyond the prescribed minimum load. The staff who will not meet their workload consistently for three months should be reprimanded.

(4) **Pension Arrears:** The Task Force noted the inability of the University to raise the necessary funds to pay off accumulated pension arrears and other terminal benefits of a large number of staff. The Task Force was of the view that unless Government intervenes Makerere University will chronically remain incapacitated by this huge debt. A one-off appropriation by Government to pay off the backlog of pension arrears and terminal benefits for this category will enable Makerere to make a new beginning and release residential houses occupied as ransom by retired staff. The University Council should activate this request immediately.

(5) **Allowances:** The Task Force recommended that the University should urgently undertake a comprehensive review of the practice on payment of allowances. It should develop a policy on realistic categories of activities that will qualify for payments of allowances for work that is beyond and above the prescribed workload of a given position. Provided that the salary proposals in the Task Force’s recommendations are implemented, top-up allowances should be abolished. Allowances should be limited and strictly monitored.

4.3.2.10 Motivation, Engagement, Commitment and Culture

The Task Force noted that Staff morale in the University is low due to poor working conditions and management practices. The Task Force recommended that the University should take all measures to comprehensively implement the Human Resource components of the University Strategic Plan. The Human Resource Manual should be updated and utilised on routine basis.

4.3.2.11 Exit Management

The Task Force recommended that view of Section 71 (1) and Section 81 of the Employment Act 2006, the University should immediately seek legal advice on the implications of termination of employment of temporary staff who have served for long periods of time. The aim would be to negotiate an amicable separation arrangement.

4.3.3 Kabaasa Committee 2013-2016

Makerere University Council in October 2015 reconstituted the Kabaasa Committee to review the financial situation of the University, in line with the implementation of the September 2013 Council decision that introduced a rationalised staff incentive as a stop-gap measure to address the staff welfare demands, arising out of the staff strike of August 2013. The Kabaasa Committee recommended several interventions. The following are the made recommendations in respect of Human Resource Management.

4.3.3.1 Organisational Structure

**Harmonisation of the Departments of Finance and Academic Registrar:** Effort should be made to reconcile the two departments to avoid unnecessary blame games and delaying of
activities. The committee recommends that all financial matters be handled by the University Bursar as is his mandate. These include; management of the fees structure, fees adjustments, fees related communications, etc. The Academic Registrar handles his mandate which includes; registering students, examinations and issuing of academic documents.

The committee recommended that the two departments work together for the common good.

4.3.3.2 Terms of Employment

(1) Teaching Loads for Academic Staff:

a) Professors and Associate Professors

- A Professor should teach a minimum of 10 hours a week and the balance of 30 used into preparation, making supervision, etc.

- A Professor whose programme is not taught in a given Semester and therefore unable to get minimum of 10 hours should justify his 40 hours by highlighting the activities he/she will be involved in.

- A Professor who may not be involved in supervision of PhD or masters students, or not doing research should be allocated more teaching load up to 16 hours.

b) Senior Lecturers and Lecturers: These should be allocated 12 teaching load per week per Semester and the other 28 hours used for supervision, marking, invigilation, etc.

c) Assistant Lecturers: These should be allocated 16 hours as teaching per week per Semester and the difference caters for marking, invigilation, etc.

(2) Justification for Part-Timers and Contract Staff: The committee noted that once the permanent staff are allocated the proposed teaching loads above, it will be difficult for many Colleges to justify the need for part timers. The Director Human Resources provides a list of permanent staff at the three ranks above together with a corresponding list of part timers to access the need for the above category of staff. It is expected that a saving will be made in this area.

(3) Teaching Staff in Administrative Positions

a) That Professors and former teaching staff who wish to remain fresh and relevant to the academia, be allowed to continue teaching at least one course but at no fee.

b) Principals and Deputy Principals be allocated 3 hours of teaching a week.

c) Deans and Heads of Departments be allocated 6 hours of teaching.

d) The administrators of this nature should be allowed to top up their hours by justifying the other activities they are involved in. These include supervision of graduate students, meetings, etc.

4.3.3.3 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

(1) Assessment of Part-Timers and Contract Staff: The Committee recommends that an audit is done to ensure that all staff have the 12 hours of teaching and also the administrators and support staff are given targets to achieve every day for the 8 hours they are in office before earning an Imprest allowance.

(2) Transfers to Units: The Committee recommends that transfers to units should be done transparently and to all where possible.
All staff staying in University houses should pay for the water they use according to their installed metres.

4.3.3.3 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

(1) **Strengthening the Revenue Unit:** The committee recommended that the revenue unit be strengthened through the following initiatives;

a) **Recruitment of ICT staff as earlier approved by council to address the issues of:** Billing – where proper bills are done for all students in the University and constantly checked for compliance.

b) Systems audit, a specialised personnel to monitor what other users of the IT system are doing and to detect any fraud that may be attempted by some users from time to time. This has lacked in the University and is partly responsible for the alleged fraud.

c) Data analysts who will possess specialized skills in managing large amounts of data and with competences in information technology and software development. The committee noted that the accountant with no IT expertise may not easily handle data analysis.

(2) **Financial Reporting:** The docket of financial reporting should be headed by a professional accountant for proper supervision and improved financial reports in future.

(3) **Affirmative Action for COBAMS:** The Chairperson visited the College of Business and Management Sciences and noted the need to put a halt on recruitments in other teaching units and consider recruiting staff of this College. This was based on the current staff/student ratio at the College and the viability of most programmes at the College.

4.3.3.5 Employee Relationship Management

(1) The Individual University officials who abuse their offices and lead the University into legal costs against it should also be reprimanded. For example, they can contribute financially to some of these costs from their salaries.

(2) **Non-Payment of Incentive to Teaching Defaulters**

a) The Committee recommends that staff that deliberately refuse to teach even when the courses to teach are available should be reported to Management and scrapped off the incentive payroll.

b) A separate mechanism should be introduced to administrative staff whose outputs are difficult to measure.

c) Staff on study leave (and not teaching/working) should not be paid incentive. A schedule of these staff should be availed by the Director Human Resources.

4.3.3.6 Exit Management

(1) Money be sought to pay off all redundant staff that have continued to remain on the payroll.

(2) All retired staff be paid off and new staff occupy the houses they currently reside in so that the University can earn through the deductions of their housing allowances.
4.4 FINDINGS ON HRM BY THE COMMITTEE, 2016 - 2017

This section presents the key finding relating to Human Resource Management based on analysis of the responses from the two studies undertaken by the Committee, baseline data from the University Official Records, the staff headcount, consultative meetings with key stakeholders and memoranda submitted to the Committee.

**Teaching Staff Study:** The Visitation Committee administered a questionnaire with various components relating to the activities within the mission of the University that contribute to the academic output of the University. A total of 1,150 out of ~1,417 academic staff representing 81% completed and returned the questionnaires. The purpose of the study was to assess the individual contribution of the academic staff of Makerere University towards the core functions of teaching & learning, research & innovations, and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking.

**Non-Teaching Staff Job Satisfaction Study:** The Visitation Committee administered a different questionnaire to the non-teaching staff. The purpose of the study was to collect insights of staff preferences and key areas to consider in developing and enhancing Human Resource practices at Makerere University. Three hundred (300) out of ~1,747 non-teaching staff representing 17% completed and returned the questionnaire by the close of the exercise that lasted three weeks.

In both studies, respondents were requested to list challenges experienced during the execution of their duties and responsibilities including reflections on performance vis-à-vis expectations and personal targets. Respondents were as well requested to propose solutions to the highlighted challenges where possible.

4.4.1 Key Statistics and Reported HR Challenges

**4.4.1.1 Staff Trends March – November 2016**

Makerere University had about 3,186 members of staff on its payroll in November 2016 with the number of employees on the payroll averaging 3,238 for the months of March 2016 to November 2016. Of these 1,417 were academic staff, 1,468 were support staff whereas 279 were administrative staff (See trends in Figure 4.4.1).
The number of staff has been reducing as demonstrated by the above steady-state seeking time series.

### 4.4.1.2 Academic Staff 2008-2016

According to official records, the total number of academic staff in 2016 was 1,461 of whom 395 (27%) were female. The academic staffing trends for the period 2008-2016 are presented in Table 4.4.1.2:

**Table 4.4.1.2: Makerere University Academic Staff Trends 2008-2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total F | 3100  
Total M | 3120  


P – Professor, AP – Associate Professor, SL – Senior Lecturer, L – Lecturer, AL – Assistant Lecturer, and TA – Teaching Assistant

### 4.4.1.3 Human Resource and Administration Challenges

Table 4.4.1.3 presents a summary of the HR and administration challenges reported by the academic and non-teaching staff during the studies.
Table 4.4.3: Reported Human Resource and Administration Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Resource and Administration Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promotion policy, delays and favoritism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of Health Insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of funding and incentives for staff development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flawed administrative processes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Limited Tools for Staff Motivation and Correction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate retirement benefits</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.4 Working Conditions and Environment Challenges

Challenges reported by academic staff regarding working conditions and work environment were as summarised and described in Table 4.4.1.4:

Table 4.4.4: Reported Working Conditions and Environment Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions and Environment Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching/work overload, unremunerated mentoring, supervision</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Persistent Students Strikes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Delayed/limited funds for practical’s, field attachment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Salaries comparatively low, untimely, incentives overdue</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No support to staff to attend conferences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical Insecurity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Difficulties with transport, meals, accommodation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1.5 Facilities and Equipment Challenges

Challenges reported by academic staff regarding facilities and equipment are summarised in Table 4.4.1.5:

Table 4.4.5: Reported Facilities and Resources Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities and Resources Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of/shared projectors/visual aids, PA systems</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Narrow/shared office space</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poor Sanitation in Rest Rooms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of laboratory space, reagents, equipment, specimens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No Clear Funding for Essentials for Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dilapidated infrastructure and obsolete equipment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inadequate/outdated teaching/training materials/books</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of office computers, furniture, curtains, stationery, maintenance</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unsuitable/inconvenient/insufficient teaching space</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Terms of Employment

(1) **Teaching/Work Overload, Unremunerated Mentoring, & Supervision:** Challenges with regard to work overload were among those that most respondents reported. Respondents said that they experienced teaching overload due to shortage of qualified staff. Most of these respondents also referred to unremunerated work on supervising and mentoring students, which does not seem to be taken into account in the computation of their salaries.

(2) **Cumbersome Process for Renewing Short-Term Contracts:** Respondents indicated that short term contracts in lieu of their engagement or promotion are cumbersome to renew.
"Short term contracts (as short as 3 months) are hectic to renew and give a feeling of non-belonging and dispensation.”

4.4.3 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

Flawed Administrative Processes: The respondents reported several challenges related to administrative processes. Chief among these was slowness in decision making and use of outdated procedures to achieve simple tasks such as getting an Identity Card (ID). Some lecturers reported that it was extremely hard to get their contracts signed. One of them noted, “It is easier getting water out of a stone than to get your contract signed at Makerere University”. Here are other typical excerpts from responses with regard to flawed administrative processes:

“Record keeping is very poor – every time one is following up something, they must have a copy of the document as the office responsible cannot find their copy…”

“No centralised secretarial and administrative services - so one does own work, which is time consuming, and hires ‘volunteers’ which is not sustainable.”

“Delayed appointment into the public service at MUK has hampered my PhD progress as most of the scholarships at MUK are given to staff members with permanent status.”

“Delayed and selective approval of study or training leaves; Failure to make decisions, at times they simply do not know what to do despite availability of guiding documents e.g. the post-doctoral training policy and other documents; My leave took over a year to approve; People simply lose training opportunities.”

4.4.4 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

(1) Identification and Appointment of University Executives and Managers: The system of election of University Executives, College Principals, School Deans and Heads of Departments is divisive and has failed to deliver the minimum required leadership at Makerere University, as it often results into caucusing, management indecision and gaps in management accountability due to allegiance to the electorate and polarisation of the University community. Additionally, the current implementation of the search practice results into inbreeding; besides it being difficult for competitive candidates outside Makerere University to be selected through this system.

(2) Promotion of Academic Staff: Academic staff were asked to list the dates of appointment or promotion to various positions since they joined the University. Table 4.4.4(a) presents the outlay of averages reported per College with a graphic represented in Figure 4.4.4(a)
Table 4.4.4(a): Average Time Taken by Academic Staff in Colleges to Progress to Next Level in Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>TA to AL</th>
<th>AL to L</th>
<th>L to SL</th>
<th>SL to AP</th>
<th>AP to P</th>
<th>TA to P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Average</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Field Data, 2016

The results summarised in Table 4.4.4(a) and Figure 4.4.4(a) provide an insight on how long it takes Staff to be promoted from one position to another in the various Colleges. For example, CHUSS and CEES provide the longest promotion cycle, especially from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. The total along each row shows how long it would take one to move through the whole career progression cycle. In CEDAT, for example, it seems impossible for one to ever become a Professor. In the case of CHUSS, it would take one a total of 35 years to progress from a Teaching Assistant to a Professor.

(3) Promotion of Non-Teaching Staff: A number of Non-teaching Staff reported that they had not been promoted for a long time, even after acquisition of higher qualifications. The Staff indicated that the promotion and appointments policy is applied exclusively to Academic Staff, unfairly excluding support and Administrative Staff. Tribalism was reported to be playing a detrimental role in promotions.

"I joined the University over 20 years but have never been promoted and I am still on M15 scale despite the fact that I have upgraded to
the degree level and part of professional level. To make it worse, all my colleagues with whom we do similar work and who joined with the same qualification are on a higher scale of M6. I have tried to address this in different fora but to no avail.”

(4) **Stagnation of Staff at one Position**: Another aspect of Staff career progression that was examined was that of Staff stagnating at one position. This was done by calculating the average number of years that respondents in each College had remained un-promoted up to the present year, 2017. The results obtained are summarised in **Table 4.4.4(b)** and **Figure 4.4.4(b)**: (TA-Teaching Assistant; AL-Assistant Lecturer; L-Lecturer; SL-Senior Lecturer; AP-Assoc. Professor; P-Professor)

**Table 4.4.4(b): Average Time Taken by Academic Staff in Colleges to Progress to Next Level in Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Average</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4.4(b): Average Time Taken by Academic Staff in Colleges at Particular Position in Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invariance in Positions</th>
<th>LAW</th>
<th>COVAB</th>
<th>CONAS</th>
<th>COCIS</th>
<th>COBAMS</th>
<th>CHUSS</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>CEES</th>
<th>CEDAT</th>
<th>CAES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Invariance in Positions**

Figure 4.4.4(b): Average Time Taken by Academic Staff in Colleges at Particular Position in Years
From the data presented in Table 4.4.4(b) and Figure 4.4.4(b) it is evident that Staff have stagnated for over 8 years as lecturers without moving to Senior Lecturer Position.

It should be noted that some respondents did not declare their positions whereas they noted the years of their appointments to various positions. This could account for some inconsistencies that might be observed in the above data. For instance, data from CAES does not exhibit staff in teaching assistant position but indicates stagnation at this position for an average of 7.5 years.

(5) **Promotion Policy, Delays and Favoritism:** Delays in promotion were reported, with an indication that there could be favouritism. It was also reported that while promotion is pegged on number of Students supervised and publications, the publications made before one acquires a PhD are not recognised by the University as a basis of promotion. Other challenges reported related to delays:

"Delay to regularise my appointment into the University service since 2010; it's been long overdue and a bit disturbing but I believe one day, I will be appointed."

(6) **Recruitment of Non-Teaching Staff:** Respondents indicated that whereas the University policy provides for internal recruitment for vacant positions, senior Staff often frustrate this effort.

"Some junior staff have better academic qualifications than senior ones and that is why they tend to sit on their promotional requests and frustrate Job adverts. The University has severally advertised and after issuing of interview invitations, the interviews are cancelled. Personally I got two invitations for an interview and they were cancelled without clear reasons. Even with positions that they purport to have issues with, they just cancel the advert, and never issue a statement or report as to what led to the cancelation. It disheartens."

4.4.5 **Performance Managements and Staff Development**

(1) **Lack of Funding and Incentives for Staff Development:** Respondents indicated that there is lack of a national or institutional-based incentive system for University staff who win donor funded research projects and those who publish their research findings in international peer reviewed journals.

"The university does not provide any form of support towards staff travel to conferences and workshops and this limits participation. I had over 15 international conference invitations but could not afford to attend."

(2) **Staff Development for Non-Teaching Staff:** Non-Teaching Staff respondents indicated that they had used their meager income to pursue further studies, given that their positions did not provide access to the University’s Staff Development programme. Respondents indicated a need to extend the Staff Development Fund to cater for non-teaching staff. It was pointed out that non-teaching staff fail to further their career due to lack of access to scholarships because these scholarships specifically target teaching staff or scientists. They also indicated that they are not allowed to go for study leave, since that would be regarded as absconding from duty.
4.4.6 Grade and Pay Structure

(1) The salary scale versus Staff numbers for the academic, administrative and support staff of the University as of November 2016 was as presented in the Table 4.4.6.1:

Table 4.4.6.1: Makerere University Staff Numbers Vs Salary Scales as of November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>952 (Cleaners &amp; Cooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M21</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Staff</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) **Salary Structure:** The single spine salary structure is a major cause of discontent – academic staff with high qualifications are on the same pay grade with non-teaching staff with lower requirements. The current salary structure is such that administrators have the same salary structure with the academic staff. A College Bursar with one degree for example gets the same salary as a Senior Lecturer that is required to have a PhD and a number of publications. These inconsistencies in the salary structures cut across public universities. For example, a person with a Master’s degree at other public universities is at the rank of a Lecturer while his counterpart with similar qualification at Makerere University is at a rank of Assistant Lecturer. This puts the teaching staff at Makerere at a big disadvantage both financially and career-wise.

(2) **Unbalanced Salary Structure:** Several respondents to the Non-teaching Staff Study singled out the unbalanced salary structure as a major cause of discontent. It was reported that the salary structure disfavoured technicians.

"There are three categories of staff in Makerere University: academic, administrative and support. Technicians based on the salary scale would be administrative or fall in support staff. It is better technicians fall in one category of staff to avoid confusion. The recent recruitment by HR put only four technicians onto the new structure out of about 100, leaving very many technicians on the old salary structure. This has created anomalies: 1) there are two remunerations with the same rank and qualifications. For example, Principal technician in old salary structure at M10 earns less than Principal technician in new salary structure at M7. 2) There are two parallel salary structures for technicians in Makerere University. 3) Most technicians who qualify for different positions in units have been left on the old salary structure."
Salaries Comparatively Low, Untimely and Incentives Overdue: Salaries were reported to be low, especially when compared with what other universities in the region pay. Besides, there were delays in paying out salaries, allowances and incentives, which was reported to demoralise staff, since they found it difficult to cater for their basic and domestic needs. The salaries earned were reported to be incommensurate with the level of service offered/expected. Lecturers were finding it quite difficult to pay school fees for their children. It was also reported that there were some lecturers who are paid for teaching when they actually do not teach but are busy on projects from which they earn quite big sums of money. The Committee observed that:

a) job analysis to inform pay grades is inadequate at Makerere University.

b) staff demand to be compensated for every task including for tasks forming part of their job.

c) the disparity between Academic Staff job specifications at various universities at national and regional levels is a cause of discontent.

d) the requirements for Academic Staff at the same rank is different in public universities in Uganda, yet there is a push for harmonised pay

Salary Enhancement: The Committee was informed that Government embarked on enhancement of Staff salaries in FY 2016/17 and this is on-going. Earlier enhancements for scientists, and latter Academic Staff resulted into discontent by the categories left out (non-scientists and non-teaching staff). This has since been resolved as illustrated in Table 4.4.6.2 which shows the detailed Salary Structure for FY 2016/17.

Figure 4.4.6: MUASA meeting the Visitation Committee on Makerere University 2016.
Table 4.4.6.2: Makerere University 2016/17 Consolidated Salary Structure with Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Teaching Staff Non-Scientist</th>
<th>Teaching Staff Scientist</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff Non-Scientist</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff Scientist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>9,626,364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>8,377,961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>7,109,882</td>
<td>3  8,031,761</td>
<td>3  5,816,715</td>
<td>3  6,586,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,104,108</td>
<td>2  8,024,937</td>
<td>2  5,810,941</td>
<td>2  6,579,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,100,024</td>
<td>1  8,020,110</td>
<td>1  5,806,857</td>
<td>1  6,574,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Or Equivalent</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>6,845,511</td>
<td>7  7,537,144</td>
<td>7  3,962,417</td>
<td>7  4,742,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,841,274</td>
<td>6  7,532,137</td>
<td>6  3,958,181</td>
<td>6  4,737,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,838,552</td>
<td>5  7,528,919</td>
<td>5  3,955,458</td>
<td>5  4,734,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,835,829</td>
<td>4  7,525,702</td>
<td>4  3,952,736</td>
<td>4  4,731,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,833,106</td>
<td>3  7,522,484</td>
<td>3  3,950,013</td>
<td>3  4,728,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,831,084</td>
<td>2  7,520,094</td>
<td>2  3,947,991</td>
<td>2  4,725,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer Or Equivalent</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>6,248,373</td>
<td>8  6,781,147</td>
<td>8  3,606,714</td>
<td>8  4,237,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,242,960</td>
<td>7  6,774,750</td>
<td>7  3,601,301</td>
<td>7  4,230,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,238,876</td>
<td>6  6,769,924</td>
<td>6  3,597,217</td>
<td>6  4,226,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,234,792</td>
<td>5  6,765,097</td>
<td>5  3,593,133</td>
<td>5  4,221,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,230,709</td>
<td>4  6,760,272</td>
<td>4  3,589,050</td>
<td>4  4,216,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,222,543</td>
<td>3  6,750,620</td>
<td>3  3,580,884</td>
<td>3  4,206,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,218,459</td>
<td>2  6,745,794</td>
<td>2  3,576,800</td>
<td>2  4,201,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,214,375</td>
<td>1  6,740,967</td>
<td>1  3,572,716</td>
<td>1  4,197,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer or Equivalent</td>
<td>M6.1</td>
<td>5,730,632</td>
<td>7  6,156,020</td>
<td>7  2,877,958</td>
<td>7  3,407,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,725,388</td>
<td>6  6,149,822</td>
<td>6  2,872,714</td>
<td>6  3,401,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,721,304</td>
<td>5  6,144,996</td>
<td>5  2,868,630</td>
<td>5  3,396,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,717,554</td>
<td>4  6,140,564</td>
<td>4  2,864,880</td>
<td>4  3,391,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,713,287</td>
<td>3  6,135,521</td>
<td>3  2,860,613</td>
<td>3  3,386,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,708,990</td>
<td>2  6,130,443</td>
<td>2  2,856,316</td>
<td>2  3,381,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,705,888</td>
<td>1  6,126,777</td>
<td>1  2,853,214</td>
<td>1  3,378,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M10

M11

PRINCIPAL TECHN
SEN.EXECUTIVE
SEN.ASST.LIBRALIAN
SEN.NURS.OFFICER 2

M7

SEN.ADMIN ASSISTANT
ADMIN ASSISTANT
PROGRAMMER
ASST ACCOUNTANT

SEN PERS.SECRETARY

M6.2

SCALE

ASST LECTURER OR EQUIVALENT

Position

Teaching Staff
Non-Scientist
4,090,506
4,086,423
4,080,648
4,078,255
4,074,171
4,070,087
4,065,822
3,313,588
3,254,933
3,250,849
3,160,787
3,156,706
3,152,622
3,148,538
3,144,454
3,140,368
3,136,283
3,132,198
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

Teaching Staff
Scientist
4,597,402
4,592,577
4,585,751
4,582,924
4,578,097
4,573,271
4,568,230
4,043,083
3,973,763
3,968,937
3,862,500
3,857,677
3,852,850
3,848,024
3,843,197
3,838,369
3,833,541
3,828,713
2,445,697
2,440,873
2,436,047
2,431,220
2,426,394
2,413,140
2,409,693
2,406,245
2,311,009
2,304,918
2,298,331
2,292,517
2,286,702
2,280,888
2,275,074
2,269,259
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4

Non-Teaching Staff
Non-Scientist
2,765,054
2,759,810
2,755,726
2,751,976
2,747,709
2,743,412
2,740,310
2,682,316
2,623,661
2,619,577
2,529,515
2,525,343
2,521,350
2,517,266
2,513,182
2,509,096
2,505,011
2,500,926
1,954,843
1,950,762
1,946,678
1,942,594
1,938,509
1,927,295
1,924,378
1,921,461
1,538,521
1,533,367
1,527,793
1,522,874
1,517,953
1,513,034
1,508,115
1,503,194
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4

Non-Teaching Staff
Scientist
3,272,437
3,266,239
3,261,413
3,256,981
3,251,938
3,246,860
3,243,194
3,144,118
3,074,798
3,069,972
2,963,535
2,958,712
2,953,885
2,949,059
2,944,232
2,939,404
2,934,576
2,929,748
2,226,544
2,221,720
2,216,894
2,212,067
2,207,241
2,193,987
2,190,540
2,187,092
1,739,157
1,733,066
1,726,479
1,720,665
1,714,850
1,709,036
1,707,222
1,697,407

96

7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
<th>Non-Teaching Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Scientist</td>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>Non-Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Secretary</td>
<td>M12</td>
<td>1,516,841</td>
<td>1,300,246</td>
<td>1,431,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,512,689</td>
<td>1,296,732</td>
<td>1,427,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Compo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,508,536</td>
<td>1,293,219</td>
<td>1,423,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Exec Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,504,382</td>
<td>1,289,704</td>
<td>1,419,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500,229</td>
<td>1,286,190</td>
<td>1,415,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,496,075</td>
<td>1,282,675</td>
<td>1,411,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,491,921</td>
<td>1,279,160</td>
<td>1,407,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,487,770</td>
<td>1,275,648</td>
<td>1,402,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,484,426</td>
<td>1,272,818</td>
<td>1,399,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech 2</td>
<td>M13</td>
<td>1,060,635</td>
<td>1,057,590</td>
<td>1,157,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steno</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,054,545</td>
<td>1,051,636</td>
<td>1,154,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,048,905</td>
<td>1,045,407</td>
<td>1,147,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen Photo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,043,732</td>
<td>1,039,317</td>
<td>1,136,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,036,270</td>
<td>1,033,225</td>
<td>1,128,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M14</td>
<td>798,657</td>
<td>795,612</td>
<td>894,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>792,566</td>
<td>789,528</td>
<td>887,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>789,528</td>
<td>786,474</td>
<td>884,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>783,429</td>
<td>779,077</td>
<td>880,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>777,352</td>
<td>774,293</td>
<td>866,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>771,245</td>
<td>767,317</td>
<td>862,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M15</td>
<td>764,312</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>852,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Employees</td>
<td>M20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>507,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>507,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>508,623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>509,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>510,135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>511,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>512,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>513,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>515,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>516,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>519,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K2</td>
<td>522,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K3</td>
<td>526,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K4</td>
<td>532,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K5</td>
<td>536,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K6</td>
<td>539,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K7</td>
<td>542,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K8</td>
<td>545,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K9</td>
<td>549,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K10</td>
<td>552,271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K11</td>
<td>555,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>529,455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University Secretary, Makerere University
4.4.7 Benefits and Allowances

(1) **Lack of Health Insurance:** A number of respondents pointed to the lack of health insurance for both Staff and Students. Some of these were on graduate courses, but have failed to complete due to health problems and the associated costs of medication, which they could not afford.

(2) **Inadequate Retirement Benefits:** Respondents who wrote about retirement reported that the retirement package was too small. Besides, the retirement process was a very lengthy process, sometimes taking years before one can access his/her benefits. Other respondents mentioned the need of a pension scheme for the University, and the possibility of setting aside a certain percentage of internally generated funds for such a scheme.

(3) **Difficulties with Transport, Meals and Accommodation:** Some respondents reported difficulties with transport, meals and accommodation. Those living far away from the University attributed lateness due to transport difficulties, sometimes resulting in missing lectures. Getting affordable and proper meals also seemed a great challenge for some.

4.4.8 Motivation, Engagement, Commitment and Culture

(1) **Bureaucracy and Arrogance:** Slow decision making and poor policy implementation were reported especially by Non-teaching Staff. Some senior Staff as well as the HR and Finance offices were accused of arrogance by many of the respondents. These pointed out to the need to restructure the current administrative structures to improve efficiency. One respondent felt that some administrative and finance functions at College level are redundant because these officers only controlled things without being effectively accountable.

(2) **Persistent Students’ Strikes:** Frequent students’ strikes were reported to disrupt teaching, supervision and other scheduled functions of the University. It appeared as if the Students were free to set up strikes anywhere and at any time. Some remedies for this problem were suggested, including the following:

   a) Increasing the executive powers of the Vice Chancellor to have more control over the University;

   b) Involving parents in discussing students’ issues;

   c) Making students sign a Code of Conduct at entry, so that they are subject to expulsion or other appropriate punishment in case of breaking that code.

(3) **Delayed/Limited Funds for Practicals, Field Attachment:** Delayed funding and other facilitation, e.g. transport and equipment required for practicals was reported to be grossly affecting field attachments and practical sessions.

(4) **No Support to Staff to attend Conferences:** Respondents reported that they missed out opportunities to attend conferences due to lack of funding, and that this was affecting staff development. One respondent noted:

   "The University does not provide any form of support towards staff travel to conferences and workshops and this limits participation. I had over 15 international conference invitations but could not afford to attend."

(5) **Physical Insecurity:** It was reported that teaching up to 9.00 or 10.00 p.m. in the night exposes Staff and Students to several risks. Cars frequently get vandalised, and
those who do not have cars are exposed to dangers such as sexual gender-based violence in case of women, theft of their phones and laptops, etc. A need to improve lighting and provision of security personnel was highlighted.

(6) **Lack of/shared Projectors/visual Aids, PA Systems:** Respondents indicated a shortage of projectors and public address systems especially for using with larger classes. Where these facilities are shared, they have to be moved from room to room, which is highly-inconveniencing and time-wasting. In big classes with no public address systems, the lecturers find it very strenuous to shout using their voices frequently up to 2 hours, and using chalk, which is also rare, to write on blackboards that remote students cannot read.

(7) **Narrow and Shared Office Space:** Some lecturers reported that they had very narrow office space that was shared, making it difficult for them to do work when at campus. This has gone to the extent of attending to students from corridors, in compound and in cars.

(8) **Poor Sanitation in Rest Rooms:** It was reported that rest rooms were in poor sanitation conditions, consequently unhealthy and embarrassing, especially when outsiders were received at the University.

(9) **Lack of Laboratory Space, Reagents, Equipment and Specimens:** Respondents reported lack of laboratory space, equipment to mount practicals, reagents, specimens and other essentials for practicals. Laboratories were reported to be dysfunctional and unable to cater for the needs of graduate students in particular.

(10) In case of Mulago Hospital where the hospital does not buy the equipment and tools needed by the students, it was suggested that a University-run hospital be established.

(11) **No Clear Funding for Essentials for Teaching:** Respondents reported that there was no clear funding for essentials required for work, including stationery, lab supplies, computers, etc.

(12) **Dilapidated Infrastructure and Obsolete Equipment:** Some facilities were reported to be in dilapidated state:

"The research laboratories are dilapidated and ill equipped to support quality research. The University does not invest in research facilities - not even the basic equipment required in the laboratories."

"Poor sanitation in the rest rooms, leading to embarrassing situations when you receive research partners from other countries."

"The vehicles used for fieldwork are very old, more than 25 years and they break down often. They are poorly maintained because the School lacks adequate funds. They put the lives of both staff and students at risk."

(13) **Inadequate/outdated Teaching/Training Materials/Books:** The respondents reported a lack of teaching materials, including books, and that many of the existing books were out of date.

(14) **Lack of Office Computers, Furniture, Curtains, Stationery and Maintenance:** Lack of tools and equipment for University work. A respondent noted; “I have had to buy my own computer and office furniture to be able to carry out University work”.
(15) **Meals, Accommodations and Drinking Water:** Respondents from the Non-Teaching Staff reported that they work till late (up to 11p.m.) which puts their lives at risk, a problem that could be solved by providing accommodation to staff working late and recruiting more staff for better services:

"Neither breakfast nor lunch is served yet we are required to be at our desks from 8:00am to 5:00pm and also expected not to leave our desks for lunch. Also drinking water is not provided. We sometimes work beyond working hours and no allowances given".

**Unsuitable/Inconvenient/Insufficient Teaching Space:** Dirty lecture rooms were reported, together with very poor sanitation facilities that were also not sufficient in number to cater for the large number of Students and Lecturers. The teaching rooms and laboratories were reported to be overcrowded:

"The laboratory space is the same as when I was a student here in the 1970’s, yet the number of students has greatly increased since then.”

(16) **Lecture theaters were reported to be too hot, lacking air conditioning systems.** Frequent load shedding/power cuts were also reported to interrupt the teaching and learning processes. In addition, noise pollution was also mentioned, particularly from people who pray and shout anytime and anywhere, and it was suggested that they too should be allocated places from which they can pray without disturbing other people on campus.

(17) **Limited Tools for Staff Motivation and Correction:** The HR Directorate at Makerere University was not well resourced for staff engagement. The Committee computed the Net Promoters Score (NPS) from the Non-teaching Staff job satisfaction study (*Table 4.4.8*). The NPS for Makerere University was -34% implying that the Staff while unhappy with the employer will stay perhaps with folded hands and are easily triggered to express discontent.
Table 4.4.8: Job Satisfaction Survey Scoreboard for Non-Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Relationship Management</th>
<th>SD (1)</th>
<th>D (2)</th>
<th>N (3)</th>
<th>A (4)</th>
<th>SA (5)</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>Average Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERM1 I am given constructive feedback about my performance by my supervisor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Agree (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM2 The Makerere University grievance management system is adequate</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Neutral (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM3 Employee performance evaluations are objective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Agree (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM4 I understand that my job is important to the overall success of Makerere University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM5 Makerere University values my contribution I make</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM6 Makerere University's policies for promotion are objectively applied to all staff</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Disagree (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM7 I can disagree with my superiors without fear of getting in trouble</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM8 I understand that my job is important to the overall success of Makerere University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM9 The University has adequate systems in place for efficient and effective communication and information sharing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM10 I would definitely recommend Makerere University to a prospective employee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development &amp; Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG1 I have adequate opportunities for professional growth at Makerere University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG2 I receive the training I need to do my job well</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG3 My supervisor is actively interested in my professional development and advancement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG4 I am encouraged to learn from my mistakes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG5 My work is challenging, stimulating, and rewarding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG6 The training I have undertaken is relevant to my job</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE1 I am satisfied with the culture at my workplace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE2 Makerere University adequately addresses Occupational Health and Safety at the workplace</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE3 There is commendable teamwork and cooperation at Makerere University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE4 My Job is meaningfully matches my Training, Qualifications, and Experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE5 I have the resources I need to do my job well</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE6 Makerere University has performance standards set for all staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB1 I am paid fairly for the work I do</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB2 My salary is competitive with similar jobs I might find elsewhere</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB3 My benefits are comparable to those offered by other organisations.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB4 I understand my benefit plan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB5 I am satisfied with my benefit package</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.9 Staff Headcount

(1) Makerere University Management presented Staff registers containing a total of 3,174 Staff. During the headcount exercise, the Committee physically verified a total of 2,523 Staff, as of February, 2017. A total of 651 Staff did not turn up for verification despite appearing on the register. Table 4.4.9.1 provides a summary:

Table 4.4.9.1: Summary of Staff Presented and those Counted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation</th>
<th>Number of Staff Submitted</th>
<th>Number of Staff Counted</th>
<th>Number of Staff Not Counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Staff</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

(2) Of the 651 Staff that did not turn up for the headcount, the University Management acknowledged a total of 628 Staff as being known to them, explaining that they missed the headcount due to various reasons, including: having been away for various reasons including sick leave, study leave, on secondment, and travel abroad. This left the balance of 12 Staff who were disowned by Management and another 11 Staff that could not be explained. This is summarised in Table 4.4.9.2:

Table 4.4.9.2: Analysis of Management Responses on Unverified Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Categories</th>
<th>Not Counted</th>
<th>Acknowledged as Known to Management</th>
<th>Unaccounted for By Management</th>
<th>Disowned by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Staff</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

(3) Conversely, during the Staff verification exercise, a total of 409 Staff who turned up for verification were not on the Staff registers presented by the University Management. On further inquiry, the University Management explained this scenario as follows:

Table 4.4.9.3: Analysis of Management Responses on Unverified Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Not on Register but Counted</th>
<th>Acknowledged by Management</th>
<th>Not Accounted For by Management</th>
<th>Disowned by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 352 Staff acknowledged by Management, a total of 12 Staff had according to
Management been verified during the headcount. Our further analysis revealed that
these Staff had been recorded on Staff registers for more than one College
(duplicates). Accordingly, a further examination is to be done to establish whether the
said Staff were not obtaining double salaries.

From the above analysis, and from the observations on payroll management, it is
evident that the University Management does not have a clean comprehensive Staff
register and payroll. The Human Resource Department did not maintain one
consolidated Staff register and payroll; rather, these were being maintained at several
Centres. Such a scenario is a recipe for errors going unnoticed, since there is no
central coordination of this function. Accordingly, the University continues to incur
losses through payment of salaries to Staff who retired or died and Staff who have
been hired irregularly and given contracts by the various Units. In addition, the budget
formula process will produce inaccurate numbers in view of inaccurate Staff numbers.

4.5 KEY LESSONS AND OBSERVATIONS FROM BENCHMARKING MISSIONS

4.5.1 HR Policies, Procedures and Systems

The Universities benchmarked have a comprehensive catalogue of HR policies which guide
the obtaining processes and provide the procedures and guideline to be followed in execution
of the delegated authority at every level for all University systems/processes.

4.5.1.1 Online Policy Toolkits

The Policies are well indexed online in well-structured online resources/policy toolkits along
with printable versions of all the University policies. MIT provides a Handbook for staff as
well as one for students. The policies are developed in consultation with appropriate
constituencies. There is a periodic review of success in fulfilling the mission and achieving
the purposes of the universities.

4.5.1.2 Policy Traceability

Rutgers University Policies are structured in such a way that they conspicuously provide for
the Policy Name, Approval Authority, Responsible Executive, Responsible Office, Date of
Original Issue, Dates of Earlier Revisions, Policy Statement, Reason for Policy, Who should
Read the Policy, Related Documents, Contacts in case of information about the Policy. This
well-organised structure makes it easy for users of the information. The University had a
Committee on Policies and Policy Libraries with the responsibilities for maintenance and
proper records management pertaining to University Policies.
4.5.2 Terms of Employment

The Universities benchmarked were cognizant of the importance of the quality of employees to the sustainability of their Institutions. For instance, the US Universities typically have Faculty (Tenured), Other Instructional Staff including Graduate Assistants on Contract; Research Staff; Administrative Staff; Support Staff; Medical/Clinical Staff in the University Hospitals; and Service Staff including Policemen. The Employment Contract outlines all the ingredient terms of service. Typically Tenured Faculty and non-unionised staff have individual contracts while unionised staff have collectively bargained employment contracts.

Contracts: It is imperative to note that apart from faculty all other employees termed as staff are appointed on contract basis; typically 3 year contracts with a 90 day induction/probation period for unionised staff with collective bargaining agreements. It was interesting to note that the MIT staff contracts have a clause barring staff to participate in any strike, walkouts or related actions which would amount to interruption or denial of the agreed service. Exempt staff are not allowed to be part of Unions as this would amount to conflict of interest. For instance, staff in the general council office cannot be part of a Union since they represent the University in legal proceedings.

4.5.3 Recruitment, Promotion, Re-Appointment and Searches

4.5.3.1 Recruitment

The President/VC: Typically US Universities go through a comprehensive search process exclusive of electioneering. Other Universities benchmarked, for example, University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania follow an open merit-based competitive process including advertising, screening and interviewing to identify and select competitive candidates.

Faculty & Senior Research Staff: The recruitment of the Faculty is the responsibility of Faculty typically through a comprehensive search process. Senior Research Staff are also recruited through a search process similar to that of Faculty. The rigor of the search process and the peer-review mechanism area designed to ensure that very competitive faculty and senior staff are recruited uniquely considering the role the position will play in the future of the institution. It is imperative to note that the search process has a global scope to ensure recruitment of the most competitive faculty and other staff recruited through searches. It is also important to note that in the US the search process is pretty much standard and typically includes support from a retained search firm. The search process commences at least one year ahead of the projected date of appointment.

Other Staff: Other categories of employees are recruited through a competitive process including interviews and/or other relevant staff selection processes deemed fit by the Human Resource Department.

Staff on Sponsored Research Projects: All staff on Sponsored Research Projects are recruited by the HR Department and their contracts managed through the central HR Systems.

4.5.3.2 Promotion and Re-Appointments

Promotion to the successive professorial ranks involves an increasing measure of participation and review by the appropriate School, acting through its council and such other means as it may choose, and monitoring by the Provost and the Academic Appointments Subgroup of the Academic Council. Consideration is given to internal and external assessments of the candidate's research ability and professional promise, and to review and
evaluation of teaching performance and other contributions. Another very important aspect noted is that the faculty members do not compete with one another for limited merit or promotion opportunities. Each individual moves to the next level when he/she is ready. This means that when the University hires a faculty member it must provide the budget for his/her entire career. Each new appointment is a major investment, as no faculty member is ever denied a promotion or merit raise for lack of funds. Faculty members, in effect, control their own destiny, and that gives them a feeling of ownership of the institution.

**Re-Appointment** as assistant professor and promotion to associate professor without tenure are made based on a judgment by the Departments and School councils, which are advisory to the dean, that the faculty member is making satisfactory progress and shows promise of meeting the standards of tenure. Promotions to associate professor are also reviewed by the Academic Council, which is advisory to the President. Promotion to tenure, however, reflects achievement of first-rank status. Assistant and associate professors without tenure may be appointed for a term of not more than five years. They may receive a series of appointments, each of a definite term, that, when taken together, are no more than the eight years that normally constitute the pre-tenure period. Non-tenured faculty may be reappointed to a current rank or promoted to a higher rank. If neither of these actions occur, their Institute appointment terminates at the end of the current appointment. Termination for cause may be made at any time.

Each appointment or reappointment to the Faculty is based on the reasonable belief that the appointee is an outstanding candidate among his or her peers and that each such action advances the Institute's educational mission. Each promotion to a higher rank is based on an appraisal of the individual's qualifications that is sufficiently broad and objective to ensure the preservation of those standards of professional and academic attainment by which the rank is characterised both within MIT and at other institutions of the first quality.

### 4.5.4 Performance Development

The Universities benchmarked place emphasis on performance development considering that the employees are qualified, committed, self-driven and globally competitive. Therefore, the focus is on ensuring that an environment is provided for ultimate employee engagement with the necessary tools for work, supervision as well as streamlined processes for staff development relevant to the position.

### 4.5.5 Benefits Plan

The US universities ensure that staff have relevant benefits plan to cover a wide range of benefits including but not limited to medical, leave, tuition remission and training. The unionised staff benefits plans are based on the collective bargaining agreements with the relevant unions.

**Work-Life Balance**: An important issue observed during the benchmarking mission with regard to talent cultivation is the matter of *work-life balance*. Because the assistant professor years usually coincide with the family formation period, many young faculty members have problems with the tenure system in the US. Faculty members with small children tend not to be as productive as those who do not have them. This is particularly true of women, but men also expressed a significant degree of concern, as most of them have working spouses or partners with whom they share childrearing responsibilities. In consideration of the stresses caused by the confluence of the biological clock with the tenure clock, the universities offer work-life balance policies.
4.5.6 Grade and Pay Structure

**Pay Differential**: The US Universities implement pay differentials for their employees informed by the position of the University in the US Education Ecosystem as well as the education market rates of the discipline. This implies that a Professor at Harvard for example will earn a different salary from a professor at another university for competitive attraction of high caliber faculty and employees. However, a Harvard Professor in Law will not earn the same as a Harvard Professor of Medicine. It was noted that this pay differential does not result into discontent since the employees know that they are different.

**Single Spine vs Multi Spine Salary Structures**: The issue at Makerere of *Single Spine vs Multi-Spine Salary Structures* does not arise in US and Cuba Universities since typically, each employee has a title descriptive of his or her function or administrative responsibility. Administrative staff appointments are encompassed within the Institute's staff salary administration programme in which each position has been assigned an associated salary range based on an evaluation of level of education and experience required in the position and the difficulty, responsibility, and impact on Institute affairs inherent in the position.

4.5.7 Grievance Management System

The benchmarked universities have comprehensive structures and systems for employee grievance management to ensure effective resolution of all incidents at the earliest possible stage. At Rutgers, a grievance is defined as "a claimed violation of university policy relating to terms and conditions of employment of the grievant". The Student and Employee Grievance Management Policy provides key milestones and strict timelines for conclusive handling of employee and student-related issues.

4.6 LEGAL, REGULATORY AND POLICY GAP ANALYSIS

4.6.1 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

**The Basic Ethical Standards Regulating the Conduct and Discipline of Members of the University**: The National Council for Higher Education is mandated by Law to set the basic ethical standards regulating the conduct of all Members of the University. The Makerere University Human Resources Manual of October, 2009 provides for the general code of behavior of University employees breach of which calls for disciplinary action. The Manual also details circumstances that amount to misconduct by a University employee and the applicable disciplinary measures.

**Policy Structures and Traceability**: The Policy on Promotion Tracks for Academic Staff of Makerere University, 2014 lays out requirements for fast-track promotion to the positions of senior lecturer, associate professor and professor and the requisite number of publications for these positions. It also provides for the requirements for ordinary track promotion to the positions of senior lecturer, associate professor and professor and the requisite number of publications for these positions. Whereas this is commendable, neither this Policy, nor the Human Resource Manual defines fast-track promotion and ordinary track promotion.

4.6.2 Job Analysis

**The Qualifications, Attributes and Person Specifications of Staff**: There are no streamlined Professional Specifications in terms of Qualifications, Experience and Character Profile of the candidates to be considered for positions at the University especially leadership positions including but not limited to VC, DVCs, Principals, Deans, Heads of Departments, Principal Investigators, Directors, Managers and all employees of the University. Without
clear specifications, the recruitment/search process is questionable in terms of transparency and integrity.

4.6.3 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

4.6.3.1 The University Search Policy/Manual

Makerere University has not instituted a Search Policy to guide and inform the search processes. A Search toolkit would provide clear guideline for all activities in the search process thereby enhancing the transparency and integrity of this process.

4.6.3.2 The Search Process of the Chancellor, VC, DVCs and College Principals

The UOTIA 2001 as amended and UOTI (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statue, 2012 do not lay out the salient processes that the University undertakes to identify the suitable candidates for appointment. The Makerere University Council Charter, 2012 does not provide guidance on the matter either. Consequently the search processes have been characterised with electioneering, lobbying, and unclear methods of work at the varied stages resulting into polarisation, and in several cases not delivering the desired results.

4.6.3.3 The Role of Appointments Board

Section 50 of UOTIA 2001, as amended:

(1) There shall be a Committee of the University Council to be known as the Appointments Board.

(2) The Appointment Board shall consist of nine members appointed under section 43.

(3) The Appointments Board shall, except where provided otherwise under this Act, be responsible to the University Council for the appointment, promotion, removal from service and discipline of all officers and staff of the academic and administrative service of the University, as may be determined by the University Council.

(4) The Appointments Board may in the discharge of its functions invite any person to give technical advice in any meeting of the Board.

The Law is ambiguous and subject to interpretation by the implementer. This is quite risky and requires attention to streamline the Law paying attention to clarity of the role and mandate of Appointments Board. Only the Appointments Board is mentioned in the principal Law as a Committee of a University Council, however, there are other Committees of Council such as: Remuneration, Audit & Risk, Finance & Investment, and Governance/Nomination Committees, which are equally important in institutional governance. This level of detail laying out the micro governance and management structures is not necessary in the Principal Law, especially when not completely addressed.

4.6.3.4 The Role of Colleges

The Human Resource Manual points to the Departmental Appointments and Promotions Advisory Committee with the mandate of considering applications at the rank of senior lecturer or equivalent and below. The Manual also points to the Faculty Appointments/Promotions Advisory Committee with the mandate of receiving recommendations from Departmental Committees and making recommendations to the Appointments Board on cases of appointment of Professors and Associate Professors and on
cases of conflicts. These roles of the Departmental and Faculty Appointments and Promotions Advisory Committees may however no longer be relevant because of the operation of the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statute Legal Notice No. 6 of 2012. Paragraph 49 of this Statute provides for the Establishment and Appointments Committee of a College. This Committee exercises such powers, functions and procedures prescribed by the Appointments Board of the University.

4.6.3.5 Promotions Policy Traceability

The Policy on Promotion Tracks for Academic Staff of Makerere University: considering that this Policy was reviewed and approved by the University Council in 2014, years after the Human Resource Manual, 2009 and the Policy on Appointment and Promotion of Academic Staff, 2009, it is presumed to have amended the two prior policies on the subject of promotions to positions of senior lecturer, associate professor and professor.

Be that as it may, if the aim of a new policy is to amend an already existing policy, it is always important to expressly state so. Policy traceability would go a long way in dispelling the likelihood of confusion amongst the policy users.

4.6.3.6 Recruitment of Staff on Research Projects

Makerere University does not have a policy to guide the recruitment of Staff on Research Projects. Project Heads typically recruit without the involvement of the Official University Appointments and HR structures.

4.6.3.7 Staffing

The Law (UOTIA, 2001 as amended) clearly provides that the academic, administrative and support staff form the Staff of a Public University who are supposed to be recruited by the Appointments Board of the respective University and will be subject to the general authority of, and responsible to the University Council and the Vice-Chancellor. There is a lacuna created in the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions (institutional standards) Regulations, 2005, Statutory Instrument No. 85 of 2005 making the application of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 21 only applicable to private universities and yet there is need for public universities to maintain adequate academic, administrative and support staff for each approved programme of study.

4.6.3.8 Professorial Growth Space

The attainment of the rank of Professor at Makerere University signifies the highest order of accomplishment of an academician. This could imply that once one is a professor there are no requirements for professional development and growth in the academia. This creates a gap in terms of the incentives for a professor’s active engagement toward sustaining outstanding performance.

4.6.4 Performance Managements and Staff Development

Performance Management: Section 11.1 of the Makerere University Human Resource Manual, 2009 provides that Performance Management shall be a continuous process involving an agreement between employee and supervisor on performance targets in every unit for every employee, formulating strategies to achieve the targets, evaluation and review of performance and agreeing on new targets. It shall aim at improving the productivity and development of all University employees. Performance reports shall be the basis for
determining performance gaps and training needs, promotion and other forms of rewards, review of job designs, and disciplinary action. Performance Management shall be very critical to the achievement of the individual targets and University objectives. There was no evidence that this policy is implemented at Makerere University.

**Employee Induction:** The Makerere University Human Resource Manual provides for employee induction in clause 2.10. There was no evidence of staff induction at Makerere University.

### 4.6.5 Pay Grade and Structure

Section 3.1 of the Human Resource Manual, 2009, further provides that all posts in the University shall be classified by title and salary scale in accordance with the duties and responsibilities carried by the post as established by the University. For full time employees salary is payable into the employee’s salary bank account at the end of every month. Section 72 (f) of UOTIA 2001 as amended, mandates the University Council to come up with Statutes to improve its functions among which include Salary for all categories of the University Staff.

### 4.6.6 Employee Relationship Management

**Staff Associations and Workers Unions:** Section 68(2) of UOTIA 2001 as amended, provides that all members of Academic, Administrative and Support Staff shall be eligible to be members of their respective associations’ consequent upon their appointment and taking up their duties. This does not make it mandatory for every staff to be a member of the respective staff association. If some members of these staff categories are not members of the associations, they can therefore not be bound by the decisions of these associations. The constitution of Makerere University Academic Staff Association (MUASA), 1975 provides for a quorum of 30 members for general meetings and 5 members for the executive meetings. However, a quorum of 30 members cannot take binding decisions for the over 1,400 academic staff.

Article 40 of the Constitution, the Trade Union Act No 7 of 2006, and the Labor Disputes (Arbitration and Settlement) Act No 8 of 2006 provide for the formation and management of labor unions, disputes and procedures for strikes. The Academic Staff associations behave as labor unions, in character, and yet they do not follow the laid down procedures for collective bargaining, consultations and disputes settlement. In particular, giving notice to strike after exhausting the laid down procedures and maintaining skeleton staff to run the University services.

As per Sections 69 and 70 of UOTIA 2001 as amended, the governance, powers and functions, and specifically the constitutions of Staff Associations should be in conformity with the statutes of the University. Section 41(d) of the Act gives powers to the University Council to make statutes under this Act. Makerere University Council is yet to enact a statute to which the constitutions of staff associations should conform. This has been the main weakness in regulating the activities of staff associations.

### 4.6.7 Benefits and Allowances

**Benefits:** The Makerere University Human Resource Manual provides for a number of benefits such as: medical care to which both the University and the employee are supposed to contribute; travel insurance cover for employees travelling by air on official duty; housing allowance/housing units for full-time employees; University assistance to employees
in accessing salary loans from financial institutions; recreational facilities; counseling services at the University Counseling Centre; places of worship such as St. Francis Chapel, St. Augustine Chapel and a Mosque; voluntary Employees’ Cooperative Saving Schemes; and statutory annual, maternity, paternity and sick leave, study leave and compassionate leave. There was no evidence of effecting benefit plans such as Health Insurance.

4.6.8 Grievance Management

The Makerere University Human Resource Manual, 2009 defines “grievance” as “a complaint concerning an issue rising from an employee’s work, workplace and/or work environment within the University”. The Draft Makerere University Grievance Resolution Policy defines “grievance” as “any real or perceived ground for complaint including perceived racial or sexual harassment; discrimination on the grounds of disability, race, ethnicity, religious belief, political viewpoint, sex, marital status or pregnancy; or any other unfair or improper treatment”. These definitions are lacking and provide ground for confusion and diversionary engagements. It would be helpful for the definition of such serious magnitude to be derived from POLICY VIOLATION. It was also observed that there is no linkage between the Policy in the HR Manual and the Draft Policy. As indicated severally, policy traceability is important to avoid doubt and confusion and clearly spell the intent and purpose of the policy in question and effect.

4.6.9 Exit Management

Section 16 of the Human Resource Manual makes provision for the circumstances under which the services of an employee of the University are terminated. There is however no programme to prepare University staff for retirement.

4.7 RECOMMENDATIONS ON HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

4.7.1 HRM Policies, Procedures and Systems

(1) There is need to update the Makerere University Human Resources Manual of October, 2009 to be in tune with current trends in Human Resource Management and to expressly require each staff to sign a Code of Ethics upon acceptance of appointment. This will guide and regulate the conduct and discipline of members of the University.

(2) University policies and procedures must be consistent with applicable laws, directives, policies, regulations, standards, and guidelines. There is need for a clear structure for policy documents including linkages to previous policies and relevant laws and regulations with express statement of the relationship(s).

4.7.2 Terms of Employment

4.7.2.1 Academic Staff Workload

Section 4.1 (a, b & c) of the Makerere University Human Resource Manual, 2009, prescribes the Minimum and Maximum Teaching Load as 10 and 12 contact hours per week, respectively. The Manual also provides a definition of the contact hour as equivalent to one hour of lectures/tutorials/clinical; or two hours of practical/fieldwork. Teaching is defined as the preparation one makes, the actual imparting of knowledge to learners, and evaluating their performance. It involves activities such as drawing course outlines, presenting knowledge to learners through lectures, and other forms of teaching, setting and marking
coursework assignments and examinations, supervising students as well as counseling and guiding students.

The measurement of contact hours toward lectures, tutorials, clinical work, invigilation, fieldwork and practicals is straightforward. There is however no clear formulae for measurement of effort in preparing course outlines, student supervision, guidance and counseling, participation in governance committee meetings, leadership, participation in viva panels, setting examinations, marking examination scripts, research and innovation projects, conference attendance, paper publication, among other academic activities.

Typically a course is 3 contact hours a week implying that to meet the workload requirements, an academic staff would take on 3 - 4 courses a semester. This workload is sufficient considering the effort to prepare, delivery, and examine the class.

(1) The University should enforce and ensure that all Academic Staff comply with the Policy mindful of the exceptions to rule provided for in the policy. The implementation should be in totality considering obligation on day, evening and weekend programmes as well as undergraduate and graduate programmes.

(2) The University should review and monitor all timetables to ensure that all Academic Staff have the minimum teaching hours. This should become part of the performance appraisal process.

(3) There should be a minimum requirement for every Academic Staff in terms of research output. A system for measuring research outputs should be instituted and made part of the performance appraisal process to ensure that the University is not paying for no services rendered.

(4) Academic Staff who cannot attain the required research outputs due to constraints in financing should have their minimum teaching load revised upwards, so as to reduce on expenditure on part time lecturers.

4.7.2.2 Employee Contract Terms

The best practice observed domestically and internationally is that permanent employment is reserved for only Academic Staff with proven and outstanding performance and a great strategic promise for the future of the University. All other employees are typically on 3-5 year contracts renewable on satisfactory performance. It is also noted that Assistant Lecturers at Makerere University are typically still students required to undertake PhD training. Public Universities should adopt contract terms for the all Non-teaching Staff and Academic Staff below the rank of Associate Professor.

4.7.2.3 Part-Time Appointments

Section 2.6.4.5 of the Human Resource Manual provides for the procedures to be followed in recruitment of part-time Staff. The University should strictly adhere to the policy provisions.

4.7.2.4 Temporary/Administrative Appointments

Section 2.6.3 of the Makerere University Human Resource Manual provides that all temporary/administrative appointments shall be made by the Vice Chancellor on the recommendation of the Appointments and Promotions Committee of the Unit in need through the Director Human Resources, provided that no such appointment shall exceed 12 months. The Policy further provides that at expiry of the 12 months the position shall be advertised either internal or externally. The Manual provides detailed processes and procedures to be
followed in the management of temporary appointments. The University should enforce compliance with these Policy provisions.

4.7.2.5 Multi-Employment

Paragraph (F-e) 1 of the Uganda Public Service Standing Orders clearly spells out that, “a public officer shall not engage in any occupation or undertaking for gain outside his or her official duties which would require his/her attention at any time during official working hours.” Makerere University full-time staff have been reported to be holding full-time positions at other institutions notably UTAMU. The Committee recommends that this issue is addressed in compliance of the Public Service Standing Orders.

4.7.3 HRM Information System(S)

4.7.3.1 Automation of Human Resource Processes

The Omaswa Task Force observed that the University Procured a Human Resource Information System (HURIS) as part of the ERP stack from ITS in the early 2000s. This system has however never been implemented and the ITS license has neither been renewed nor the system upgraded. Automation of the HR Processes would go a long way in enhancing the quality of service delivery right from recruitment, leave management, payroll management, staff workload management, through to exit management in a transparent manner informed by readily available and reliable information for Management decision-making.

It is strongly recommended that the University acquires and implements an Integrated ERP with the requisite Automation Support for all HR Processes and a System Architecture that captures the University Custom Workflows cognizant of the User Requirements at all Units including Colleges.

4.7.3.2 Staff Identification System

The Omaswa Task Force strongly recommended that identification of all Staff and Students should be made mandatory and implemented using modern technology. The Staff Identification System should be an integral part of the recommended Integrated ERP for Makerere University.

4.7.3.3 Online HR Portal

Makerere University reserved a URL (http://hr.mak.ac.ug), we believe with the intent of an online HR Portal. However this portal is not accessible. It is recommended that Makerere University develops and actively maintains a comprehensive online HR Portal with information dashboards and key toolkits say for HR Policies in a simple structured way to enhance access to HR Information on policies, procedures, key reports, among others; as is elsewhere. Benchmarking the MIT HR Portal (http://hrweb.mit.edu) would be helpful.

4.7.4 Job Analysis

All University positions must have clearly documented job profiles laying out the roles, responsibilities, reporting structures, associated experience and qualifications requirements. There should be careful attention to exploring the total job and providing the job description and the job specification (see figure under). clear job analysis will inform the entire human resource management value chain and related interventions from recruitment to exit management as it answers the questions of: who are we looking for?, to do what?, and how do we reward them equitably for their services?
4.7.5 Recruitment, Re-Appointment, Promotion and Searches

The University should adhere to transparent practices for employee recruitment, promotion and re-appointment. It should be clear for especially administrative and support Staff what the job specifications are and the obtaining requirements for promotion where applicable. The HR Directorate should use a comprehensive web portal to disseminate information about HR policies and practices for all Staff at Makerere University. The appraisal system for promotion and re-appointment needs to be clear to all stakeholders and adhered to by the University.

4.7.5.1 Recruitment of Employees of the University

The University has attempted to implement a search process for Top Executives (VC, DVCs, & College Principals) which has been grossly characterised by electioneering, concerns about transparency, and typically resulting into a polarised University Community. It is thus clear that much as similar search practices are successful especially in the USA with over 4,200 Universities providing a good search space, the higher education system in Uganda is not yet ready to realise a valued search process. It is therefore recommended that all positions (Academic Staff, Administrative Staff; Support Staff; and Research and Project Staff) at Public Universities should be filled by qualified and competitive candidates selected through an open and competitive recruitment process including advertisement, screening, interviews and merit-based appointment of the most competitive candidate by the respective appointing authority. The Law (UOTIA, 2001) should be amended accordingly.

4.7.5.2 Human Resource Management Leadership

The Committee recommends that the University hires qualified, experienced and seasoned HR Professionals for the positions of HR in the University including leadership of the Appointments Board. Makerere University is a premier University in Africa, there should be clear segregation of duties and responsibilities for the HR Officers to inform quality service delivery in this central function of the University.
4.7.5.3 **Staff Qualifications Unmatched with Current Position**

The Omaswa Task Force noted that several Administrative and Support Staff have qualifications outside their job requirements (*over-qualified and mis-qualified*). The HR System in Public Universities should streamline the process of Staff development to ensure that Staff are only permitted to pursue further studies in areas relevant to their career development. The system should further be strict on job specifications for Administrative and Support Staff with no room for over qualified or mis-qualified Staff. Over qualified or mis-qualified Staff are a key source of discontent, typically being disgruntled and having ambitious demands while undermining their jobs. As such, in line with the Omaswa Task Force recommendation, over qualified and mis-qualified Staff should be released with immediate effect.

4.7.5.4 **Recruitment of Staff on Research Projects**

There is need for a streamlined policy and structures for recruitment of Staff on projects to mitigate the underlying enterprise risks. Project Heads should involve the official University appointments and HR structures.

4.7.5.5 **Staffing**

1. The provisions of the law (UOTIA, 2001) clearly provide that the *academic, administrative* and *support* staff form the Staff of a Public University who are supposed to be recruited by the appointments board of the respective University and will be subject to the general authority of, and responsible to the University Council and the Vice-Chancellor. There is a lacuna created in the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions (institutional standards) regulations, 2005. Statutory Instrument no. 85 of 2005 making the application of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 21 applicable to Private Universities only and yet there is need for Public universities to maintain adequate academic, administrative and support staff for each approved programme of study.

2. Makerere University should undertake a comprehensive strategic planning exercise to ultimately ensure that staff: student ratios are in compliance with the prescription of the NCHE. Specific attention should be given to COBAMS and DICTS these being Units with acute staff shortages.

3. **Directorate of Legal**: The University should expeditiously fill the vacant positions, secure the chamber status for their Directorate and subsequently require the Directorate to represent them in all future legal matters.

4. **Directorate of Internal Audit**: The University should address the staffing gaps within the Internal Audit Directorate in regard to the required numbers of staff and skills. Furthermore, the University should agree on the Internal Audit Strategy, and harmonise its policies and guidelines regarding the pre-audit functionality.

4.7.5.6 **Professorial Growth Space**

There is need to define a formal growth trajectory for staff at the rank of Professor to support their continuous professional growth and development. Such incentives motivate a professor’s active engagement in sustaining outstanding performance.
4.7.5.7 The Role of Colleges

The Human Resource Manual should be updated to include the College system requirements as provided for in the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statute Legal Notice No. 6 of 2012. Paragraph 49 of this Statute provides for the Establishment and Appointments Committee of a College. This Committee exercises such powers, functions and procedures prescribed by the Appointments Board of the University.

4.7.5.8 Succession Planning and Mentorship

It is typical that Heads of Departments are drawn from Unit Staff who then usually rise to Deanship, Principal, DVC, VC and other Executive Positions and Research Leadership Positions in the University. The University should institute a Leadership Development Programme to develop candidates for positions of Leadership.

4.7.6 Performance Managements and Staff Development

4.7.6.1 Recognition and Rewarding Outstanding Performance

The policy on awards and recognition of outstanding performance should be reviewed and accordingly implemented as provided for in Section 11.6 of the Makerere University HR Manual, 2009.

4.7.6.2 Employee Induction

The Makerere University Human Resource Manual provides for employee induction and orientation in section 2.10. There is no evidence of staff induction at Makerere University. It will be important to develop a comprehensive induction policy paying attention to the position specific imperatives of the employee induction process on top of implementing a comprehensive induction program for each new appointee.

4.7.6.3 Higher Education Leadership and Pedagogical Training

Higher education leadership training should be a requirement for all those in any form of leadership. Teaching Staff should also undergo continuous pedagogical training to empower them to perform the ingredient tasks.

4.7.6.4 Staff Appraisal System

The McGregor Committee recommended that a Staff appraisal system should be universal, regular and effective with feedback. Students should be involved in the appraisal and assessment of Academic Staff and should have a right appeal against academic assessment. It was further noted that section 11 of the Makerere University HR Manual provides a Staff appraisal policy. This should be implemented.

4.7.7 Pay Grade and Structure

There have been several interventions along with protracted debates relating salary enhancement with specific attention to Scientists and Staff in Clinical Sciences at Public Universities. It is recommended that the salary should be associated with a specific position and should take into account the job specifications (qualifications, experience, skills & competences); discipline-specific market forces; the position of the University in the Regional Higher Education Ecosystem; and the capacity of the University to sustainably furnish the Payroll. The University Council of a Public University as mandated by the Law,
should take all these factors into consideration when setting salary (pay grade) for University employees Job-by-Job.

Considering the discontent arising from Staff pay and resultant shutdowns and strikes it is imperative that the University Council enacts a comprehensive Statute outlining the procedures to be followed for setting Staff salary and related emoluments.

4.7.8 Benefits and Allowances

4.7.8.1 Employee Benefits Plan

Benefits associated to the Job should be effected as part of the terms of employment, including Health Insurance.

4.7.8.2 Allowances

The McGregor Committee and Omaswa Task Force noted the present system or culture/practice of paying wide ranging “Allowances” at Makerere University. The University following the Kabaasa Committee consolidated all allowances into a “salary incentive” which has proven unattainable. With the Government programme already under implementation to enhance staff salary, the concept of an unsustainable “salary incentive” is untenable and MUST STOP (Abolish the Salary Incentive). With streamlined pay grade and structure cognizant of one’s discipline at a University, there is then need to develop a clear policy on applicable Benefits and Allowances per Job. Allowances should exclude payments for work forming part of the employee contract.

4.7.8.3 Pension Arrears

The Omaswa Task Force noted the inability of the University to raise the necessary funds to pay off accumulated pension arrears and other terminal benefits of a large number of Staff. The Task Force observed that unless Government intervenes Makerere University will chronically remain incapacitated by this huge debt. A solution should be sought to clear pension arrears and terminal benefit to enable the exit of former cleaners and cooks (over 950) who have been retained at the University without duty station.

4.7.9 Grievance Management System

At Rutgers, a grievance is defined as “a claimed violation of university policy relating to terms and conditions of employment of the grievant”. The Makerere University Human Resource Manual, 2009 defines “grievance” as, “a complaint concerning an issue arising from an employee’s work, workplace and/or work environment within the University”. The Draft Makerere University Grievance Resolution Policy defines “grievance” as any real or perceived ground for complaint including perceived racial or sexual harassment; discrimination on the grounds of disability, race, ethnicity, religious belief, political viewpoint, sex, marital status or pregnancy; or any other unfair or improper treatment. These definitions are lacking and provide ground for confusion and diversionary engagements. It would be helpful for the definition of such serious magnitude to be derived from POLICY VIOLATION. Transparency and accountability in grievance management assures employees and students of fair and equitable treatment. The University should set in place streamlined systems and structures for grievance management.

4.7.10 Regulations for Staff Associations

As per Sections 69 and 70 of UOTIA 2001, the governance, powers and functions of staff associations should be in conformity with the statutes of the University. Specifically the
constitutions of staff associations should conform to the statutes of the University. Section 41(d) of the Act gives powers to the University Council to make statutes under this Act. Makerere University Council should enact a statute that regulates activities of staff associations among others, clearly spelling out what constitutes quorum for resolution of Staff Association as is the practice is other similar jurisdictions.

4.7.11 Working Environment and Conditions

Employee engagement is a workplace approach resulting in the right conditions for all members of an organisation to give of their best each day, committed to their organisation’s goals and values, motivated to contribute to organisational success, with an enhanced sense of their own well-being. The University should strive to provide the necessary tools for efficient and effective execution of the Staff-prescribed duties. Effort should be made to ensure that the requisite tools and accessories for recommended occupational health and safety are duly provided.

The Government initiative to improve pedagogical facilities at Public Universities under the AfDB V HEST Infrastructure Development Programme is a step in the Right Direction.

1. The University should prioritise staff medical insurance, staff development, retirement benefits and the essential work tools and materials in annual work plans and budgets.

2. Public Universities should be required to develop and submit to the Line Ministry an Annual Maintenance Plan for Equipment, Facilities and Infrastructure.

3. Public Universities which have not been considered under the AfDB V HEST Project should be considered for the Infrastructure and Facilities Grants.

4.7.12 Exit Management

Section 16 of the Makerere University Human Resource Manual, 2009 makes provision for the circumstances under which the services of an employee of the University are terminated. However, there is need for a programme to prepare University Staff for retirement through training and advice. This advice should be in line with lucrative business opportunities within and beyond Uganda in line with the employee’s interest to secure a smooth employee retirement transition.

4.7.13 Human Resource Records and Payroll Management

Makerere University Management is advised to undertake a comprehensive review of its current Staff records and payroll with a view of eliminating Staff who have left and those that have been irregularly hired. The response by the Accounting Officer, that there has since been a centralization of all payroll management functions to the Directorate of HRM, is a step in the right direction and should be strictly implemented by Management.
CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

As provided for in Section 24 (2) of the Law, a public university has a three-fold mandate, i.e.:

(1) the provision of higher education, promotion of research and advancement of learning;

(2) dissemination of knowledge and giving opportunity of acquiring higher education to all persons including persons with disabilities wishing to do so regardless of race, political opinion, colour, creed, or sex; and

(3) the provision of accessible physical facilities to the users of the Public University.

Therefore, a university plays a vital role in enhancing research, learning and knowledge dissemination through equitable access to quality higher education and training.

In the Makerere University Fact Book (2016: 1) the Vision of Makerere University is “to be the leading institution for academic excellence and innovations in Africa,” and her Mission is “to provide innovative teaching, learning, research and services responsive to national and global needs.”

The three core functions of Makerere University highlighted in her Strategic Plan (2008/09 – 2018/19) are teaching and learning, research and innovations; and knowledge transfer partnerships and networkings. To reposition herself to meet the emerging challenges, the University focused on key crosscutting issues, i.e.: quality assurance, ICT, human resource development, library services, physical infrastructure and gender mainstreaming supported with adequate funding and good leadership and management. In alignment with her Strategic Plan, the contribution of Makerere University to the training and capacity building of the workforce at the national, regional and international levels cannot be underestimated. In the period between 2008 and 2016, the University maintained a share of about 21% of eligible A-level Students. In the same period, the number of Students (undergraduate and graduate) increased from 5,669 to 14,193.

The University has also consistently ranked high in research and innovation during the period. For instance, the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking placed Makerere University in the 3rd position in Africa in 2017, after the University of Cape Town and the University of Witwatersrand.

In relation to its ToR, the Committee undertook this assignment focusing on the three core functions of the University, highlighted in Makerere Strategic Framework: 2007/08-2017/2018, namely: Teaching & Learning; Research & Innovations; and Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking.

5.2 GENERAL AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

General Objective: To assess the state and relevance of the management of the functions of teaching, research and innovations and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking, and how these are likely to predispose the Makerere University to strikes by Staff and Students.

Specific Objectives

The following were specifically reviewed, in order to study, analyse and make actionable recommendations on the academic affairs at Makerere University:
(1) quantity, quality and relevance of academic programmes.
(2) teaching and learning environment at the University and at Jinja Off-Shore Campus.
(3) quality and relevance of assessment and examination strategies.
(4) infrastructure and support systems for research and innovations at the University.
(5) infrastructure and support systems for knowledge transfer partnerships and networking at the University.
(6) quality and quantity of academic and technical staff and support services.
(7) quality and quantity of academic support services for students.

In undertaking this activity, the Committee analysed the systems and processes in the management of academic affairs at national and institutional level. This included a review of the Law governing academic affairs in public universities, and the policies and practices related to teaching and learning, as well as the support infrastructure and facilities at Makerere University. Firstly, the Committee reviewed the progress on the implementation of academic-relates affairs in previous reports.

5.3 REVIEW OF PROGRESS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACADEMIC-RELATED AFFAIRS IN PREVIOUS REPORTS

This review is based on the reports on Makerere University as stipulated in the ToRs, i.e. McGregor Visitation Committee Report 2007, the Omaswa Report 2014, and the Kabaasa Reports I, II, III (2011-2014). The reports are thematically reviewed below.

5.3.1 Teaching, Learning and Quality of Education at Makerere University (Omaswa 2014)

Recommendations:

(1) Academic programmes should be relevant and duplication should be minimised.
(2) All academic and administrative staff should be provided with induction and ongoing training in the Core functions of the University. All academic staff should undergo special training in teaching and learning methodology.
(3) The current trends in global higher education are embracing Competency-Based Education as an approach for producing relevant and responsive graduates. The Makerere College of Health Sciences has already initiated this approach. The Task Force recommends that it should be extended to the rest of the University.
(4) Staff/Student ratios should gradually be lowered to meet the standards recommended by NCHE. This should also apply to physical facilities including classrooms, laboratories and operating budget.
(5) Through the Quality Assurance Directorate, Makerere University initiates graduate tracking with immediate effect.

State of the Recommendations: The University is currently reviewing its programmes to address the issues of duplication and relevance raised in earlier reports. It is hoped that there will be a corresponding review of the teaching, learning and assessment methods and that the courses will be differentiated, follow the competence-based approach and will be relevant to Uganda, the region and beyond. This will also necessitate the development of a costed plan to implement a competence-based approach and ensuring that Colleges do not mount Programmes beyond their mandate.
Some of the recommendations were constrained by the absence or lack of attempt at institutionalizing higher education pedagogy. There is now evidence of an academic home for such a programme.

5.3.2 The University-Wide Internship Programme  
(Omaswa, 2014)  

**Recommendation:** The University should review the internship programme to address significant reforms in mind-set and attitude change, financing, supervision and relevance of the academic programmes to the labour market.

**State of the Recommendation:** The Visitation Committee anticipates that the Internship and other approaches to community-based learning will be reviewed alongside the ongoing programme restructuring.

5.3.3 E-Learning  
(Omaswa, 2014)  

**Recommendation:** The University should utilize E-learning to strengthen teaching and learning.

**State of the Recommendation:** The Committee noted that the Distance Learning Policy was approved by Council, and that there are opportunities to roll-out more programmes on the Distance/Online/E-learning modes. However, the E-learning facility is not enhanced and broadened due to funding challenges. Few academic programmes were using the Blended/Online/E-learning mode. Senate is yet to consider establishing Committees on ICT, Student Welfare and Discipline as recommended in the previous Reports. The AfDB V HEST Project is expected to expand ICT facilities and competence. This should enable the University move rapidly to integrate ICT in all teaching/learning, assessment and research.

5.3.4 Research Agenda  
(Omaswa 2014)  

**Recommendations:**

(1) The priority research agenda of the University should be regularly reviewed to ensure its responsiveness to societal needs, including developing structured linkages with Government ministries, Parliament and the Civil Society to promote dialogue and facilitate the University’s contribution to policy formulation and implementation.

(2) The University should develop an integrated and interdisciplinary Research Agenda, which is responsive to national and global development needs and priorities.

(3) The University should promote research across all Academic disciplines for Makerere to become a truly research-led University, according to its Strategic Plan.

(4) This calls for Research Leadership at the highest level by establishing the post of a DVC for Research, Innovations and Development. This is consistent with the practice in other leading universities.

**State of the Recommendations:** The established Directorate of Research and Graduate Training is still sufficient for coordinating the research in the University. It has been effective in managing competitive research funds of the Donors, especially for doctoral candidates and postdoctoral fellows. However, most of the research funds come from Government and Development Partners; with the University allocating less than 1% of her Internally Generated Funds to Research.
5.3.5 Library Services

(Omaswa 2014, McGregor Visitation Committee 2007)

Both Reports indicate that the library services are under-funded, therefore below standards of a modern University. According to McGregor (2007) the funding of libraries in public universities ranges between 1.3% and 5% of the annual University expenditure. There was need to raise the library budget to the acceptable level of 10% of University budgets. Finance administrators were to ensure that libraries are allocated adequate budgets and actually receive them.

State of the Recommendation: The Committee commended the University for expanding the Library’s physical and digital space; however noted that the 10% library budget was not followed through by the University.

5.3.6 Assessment and Examinations

(Omaswa 2014)

Recommendation: review the examination practices to address malpractices that have marred the quality of qualifications.

State of the Recommendation: The Committee noted the continuous effort by Senate and Management to address this. However, more vigilance is needed by all stakeholders to curb malpractices by Staff and Students.

5.3.7 Teaching and Learning Infrastructure and Equipment

(Omaswa 2014, McGregor 2007)

Recommendations:

a) Refurbish dilapidated classrooms, laboratories, halls of residence, among others. Most of these buildings have been in existence since colonial days.

b) Expand the teaching and learning infrastructure.

State of the Recommendation: Government is addressing infrastructural challenges by refurbishing existing buildings and expanding teaching and laboratory space at the University under the AfDB V HEST Project.

5.3.8 Science, Technology & Innovation

(McGregor, 2007)

Recommendation: Government should re-focus funding on Science, Technology and Innovations.

State of the Recommendation: Government through the African Development Bank (AfDB V-HEST) Project is rehabilitating, modernising and expanding infrastructure in some public universities. Through this intervention, Makerere University seems to be making good progress in expanding ICT facilities and competence, and should move rapidly to integrate ICT in all teaching/learning, assessment and research as recommended in the Omaswa Report.

5.3.9 Staffing

(Omaswa 2014, Kabaasa 2013)

In the Kabaasa Report (2013) it is observed that some Staff have a teaching deficit, while the Auditor General (AG) in his 2015 Report notes significant staff shortage with major staffing gaps between the established positions compared to the currently filled positions. The staffing challenges affect the quality of academic services offered by the Staff to Students. The
quality of teaching and learning is also affected by Academic Staff in some Colleges not meeting their workload, i.e. the recommended 10 hours per week (Kabaasa, 2013: 4). Kabaasa (2013) recommends that all Senior Academic Staff including Professors should teach on both graduate and undergraduate programmes, especially, first years. Amidst slow Staff promotions, there is no institutionalised training for Staff on how to teach and assess students (Omaswa, 2014).

**State of the Recommendation:** Under the AfDB V HEST Project, scholarships have been given for staff training on Masters’ degrees and PhD Programmes to improve staff quality and quantity. Development Partners such as SIDA have also made noble contribution to Staff capacity building. However, Academic Staff need continuous pedagogical competence-based and e-pedagogy training.

5.3.10 Affirmative Action  
(McGregor, 2007)

McGregor raised concerns on affirmative action in favour of females getting an extra 1.5 points to compete favorably against males in admissions to various undergraduate programmes.

**State of the Recommendation:** The policy on affirmative action is still in place at Makerere University, and has helped increase the female student at the University. All other students are admitted on merit including children of Staff. The University gives a 50% fees waiver for children of members of staff.

The Visitation Committee established that all the previous Reports point to inadequate funding of the three core functions of teaching, research & innovation, and knowledge transfer partnerships & networking. Some of the recommendations in the McGregor and Omaswa Reports are notably long term and need substantial funding and investment in human resources and in infrastructural expansion.

5.3.11 Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking  
(Omaswa, 2014)

**Recommendations:**

(1) The Task Force recommends the establishment of a dedicated office in the Central Administration to support the Vice Chancellor in promoting partnerships and collaborations.

(2) The Task Force recommends the revitalisation of this Public-Private Partnership by the University Administration. The ongoing partnership with UIRI as a Public Sector Research and Development (R&D) institution is commendable and should be used as a model.

(3) The internship programme at Makerere University is appreciated by all stakeholders. However, its implementation calls for significant reforms in financing, supervision and relevance to academic programmes of the students. The Task Force recommends that the University administration immediately undertakes a review to address the above concerns.

(4) The Task Force recommends that Government reintroduces National Service, along with the patriotism initiative that is already in place, through the Ministry of Information and National Guidance.
(5) The Task Force recommends that the priority research agenda of the University should be regularly reviewed to ensure that it is responsive to the needs of society. The University should develop structured linkages with Government Departments, Parliament and Civil society to promote dialogue and facilitate the University’s contribution to policy formulation and practice. The Task Force also recommends that Government should be proactive in reaching out to the University to seek solutions and to identify national priorities for research and joint action.

State of the Recommendations: The University has an International Office in the Office of the Vice-Chancellor but has been quite ineffective.

5.3.12 Recommendations of the White Paper 2008 Emerging from the McGregor Committee on Academic Matters

(1) Teaching and Learning

Recommendation 17: At present, specialisation is too early and there is little scope for change for mobility of students amongst disciplines and career choices or for broad liberal Public Universities be modified to permit students to offer both science courses and arts courses in the same programme.

Comment: Recommendation was recast as follows: Government will re-examine the curricular at all levels of education. Universities will be required to revisit their respective curricular particularly in the first year of the degree programmes.

Implementation strategy: It be implemented in phases. Government through NCDC will re-examine the curricular for O-Level and A-Level and address the concerns raised by the Committee. Universities will be encouraged through the relevant organs to review their courses particularly in the first-year degree programmes so as to allow flexible choices.

State of the Recommendation: There has been continuous review of University curriculum since 2010 and the University Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Programmes Restructuring Committee (2016) whose mandate was on relevance, elimination of duplication, phasing out programmes, and viability among others.

(2) Research and Innovation

Recommendation 28: Public Universities should develop stronger involvement in public/private research and development to deploy the full potential of our science and technology graduate so as to contribute to national development/ economic growth.

Comment: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation strategy: Government and private sector will strengthen collaborative research and application into national growth and development initiatives.

Recommendation 29: The overall records of the Public Universities in research and publications fall well below NCHE requirements. Public Universities should provide more funding, training for research and publication. Public Universities should do more basic research. In light of this, Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR) and the School of Postgraduate Studies should thoroughly redefine their roles. The Postgraduate School should focus on training high level personnel for universities and the nation. MISR should be funded for applied development and basic research. The vacancies for Researchers and other academic staff at MISR should be filled to enable that Unit fulfill its functions.
Comment: Universities and Government will provide more funding, training for research and publications, in accordance with the African Union Lagos Plan of Action (1980) whereby 3% of GDP of each country should be used for this purpose. Public Universities will develop stronger involvement in public/private research.

Implementation strategy: It will be implemented within short term (1-2) years.

State of the Recommendation: Following transformation into a collegiate University, the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training (DRGT) was established to be in charge of research and graduate training. Moreover, MISR has also embraced the teaching function by mounting an interdisciplinary MPhil/PhD programme.

Recommendation 30: Currently, the training of Postgraduate students is left to private and donor funding leading to very low output.

Government should resume funding for Postgraduate students.

Comment: Recommendation was accepted. Government has resumed funding postgraduate students in fields critical to socio-economic transformation.

Implementation Strategy: Both Government Institutions and the Private sector will be urged to invest in Postgraduate studies critical to national development.

State of the Recommendation: Whereas there has been a commendable shift to build strong local PhD programmes and funding PhDs registered locally at Makerere University by the Donors, Postgraduate education and training has not yet benefited from funding by Government in many of the disciplinary fields.

(3) Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networks

Recommendation 22: Practical work is crucial in training of Science and Technology Students and requires provision of laboratory/workshop space and materials. Currently, Public Universities are producing scientists/technologists with little practical experience. Therefore, Public Universities should put emphasis on provision of functional laboratory/workshops.

Comment: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: Government will continue support to practical work and as stated in Recommendation 21, laboratory/workshop space will be given priority.

State of the Recommendation: Whereas Internship was adopted for all undergraduate programmes by Makerere University in order to improve on practical experience, it lasts 4-8 weeks each academic year, which period may be short.

Recommendation 31: NCHE should come up with a flexible system to permit upward and downward mobility as well as transfer of students amongst programmes and institutions of tertiary education.

Comment: Recommendation was accepted.

Implementation Strategy: It will be implemented in the short-term. Government and private sector and institutions will support in provision of required inputs.

5.4 FINDINGS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Makerere University Strategic Plan 2007/08-2017/18 prospected among other things improved relevance and quality of teaching and learning. The strategic focus was to produce a graduate who would not only command traditional academic and subject specific skills but also possessed generalist skills such as, problem solving, reflective abilities, willingness to learn and a predisposition to lifelong learning. The University in the past decade purposed to become a learner-centred and research-led University as enshrined in her Strategic Plan (2007/08-2017/18). To become a learner-centred University, the Strategic Objectives related to the first core function of Makerere University, i.e. teaching and learning were:

1. To integrate ICTs and gender in teaching and learning and provide high quality, and a variety of relevant and up-to-date teaching and learning materials,

2. To provide academic programmes that impart both subject matter knowledge, and skills and generalist skills,

3. To promote open and distance learning,

4. To integrate international perspective into the curriculum,

5. To promote collaboration with other institutions in the design of academic programmes,

6. To promote provision of Makerere University programmes by other institutions in the country, and

7. To operationalise the semester system and introduce a modular arrangement (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016)

The Committee studied and examined the legal and regulatory framework for academic affairs; the status of admissions, enrolment, identification, and graduation rates; academic programmes; STEM enrolment, programmes and pedagogical infrastructure; the implementation of teaching and learning, management of assessment and examinations; management of academic records; and University facilities and equipment. Below the Committee presented the key findings and recommendations on the above thematic areas.

5.4.1 The Law and Management of Academic Affairs

UOTIA, 2001 as amended, is clear on the management of Academic Affairs of a University in Uganda. Section 44 of the Law provides for the establishment of Senate; while Section 45 provides for the mandate of Senate chaired by the Vice Chancellor to be responsible for the control and direction of academic affairs, the formulation of academic policies, and tendering advice to the University Council. Therefore, the coordination Centre for the academic affairs of the University is the office of the VC with Senate as the policy-making organ. To oversee the implementation of the University’s academic policies, the Vice Chancellor is supported by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs) and the Office of the Academic Registrar (AR), the College Principals, the Deans and Heads of Departments. Therefore, the Law is clear about the reporting structures in the management of academic affairs at Makerere University.

However, findings indicate an overlap of functions in the Offices of the DVC AA and the AR. In addition, the College Statute is noted to create another tier in the academic rung, creating more bureaucracy and red tape in academic management and decision making.
5.4.2 Student Admissions, Enrolment, Identification and Graduation Rates

5.4.2.1 Management of Admissions

The Committee noted the challenges in handling the 2016/17 students’ admissions due to the premature withdrawal of the Computerised Education Management & Accounting System (CEMAS), which was aimed to manage online admissions. There were challenges in the Office of the AR using the CEMAS online application, including inadequate facilities and trained manpower to register students. In the same academic year, 15 students on the Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery presented forged documents on the CEMAS system and in their defense claimed they were not responsible for posting the documents, and consequently sued the University.

At the time of the Committee’s visit, the Directorate of Information Communication Technology (DICTS) was in the interim tasked by Management to provide an IT support system to the Office of the AR to secure Students’ records. The Directorate was funded to purchase computers but due to the lengthy procurement procedure, the Office had reverted to the manual system to manage Student’s admissions and other processes.

5.4.2.2 Student Enrolment at Undergraduate and Graduate Levels

Table 5.4.2.2 shows the total Student enrolment at undergraduate and graduate levels in the past three years.

Table 5.4.2.2: Total Student Enrolments by Level 2013/14 - 2015/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>Overall % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>38984</td>
<td>36376</td>
<td>36947</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3524</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42508</td>
<td>38586</td>
<td>39546</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduate</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Makerere University Fact Book, 2016

As illustrated in Table 5.4.2.2, the overall growth in enrolment of both undergraduate and graduate Students in the three-year period is 13%.

(1) Admission of Undergraduate Students

Although there is a 13% overall growth in enrolment, there is reduction in undergraduate students’ admissions in the Colleges of Computing & Information Sciences (COCIS), Humanities and Social Sciences (CHUSS) and Natural Sciences (CONAS) between 2008/09 and 2015/16.

(2) Admission of Graduate Students

According to the Makerere University Fact Book, 2016, the overall graduate admissions have grown by 3% over the period, especially in the following Colleges: College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences (CAES), College of Engineering, Design, Art & Technology (CEDAT), College of Health Sciences (CHS), CONAS and College of Veterinary Medicine, Animal Resources and Biodiversity (COVAB). However, the Colleges of Business & Management Sciences (COBAMS), COCIS, Education & External Studies (CEES), CHUSS, and the School of Law (SoL) have registered a decline in graduate admissions over the period. The University has recorded a decline in admissions to Programmes in Business and Economics by 15% and in Humanities by 40%. Science and Technology Programmes recorded an increase of 51% over the period.
It is noted in the Makerere University Fact Book that during the period, doctoral admissions more than doubled; while there was a 7% decline in admissions on masters’ degrees over the period.

(3) Admission of International Students

Over the years, Makerere University has had considerable academic footprints in the region, on the continent and at international level. For instance, between 2011 to date, it has registered students at graduate level from America, Germany, Italy, Japan, Finland, Norway, India, South Africa, Swaziland, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leon, Gambia, Benin, Nigeria, Ghana, Congo, Somalia, Sudan, Rwanda, Kenya and Tanzania.

However, according the Makerere University Fact Book, 2016, other than the Science-based Colleges of CHS, CONAS and COVAB which had recorded an increase in the number of international students in their programmes, the rest of the Colleges saw a decline, with undergraduate programmes being most affected, i.e. from 8% in 2008/9 to 1% in 2015/16 (less than 500) (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016), in comparison with Rutgers with 111,720 and the Cuban Higher Education System with 14,000 international students in 2017.

Notwithstanding the market dynamics which provide students with a wider choice for quality higher education, this decline could also be attributed to the following:

1. declining quality of education at Makerere University (Omaswa, 2014),
2. the poor image caused by strikes, and
3. an inadequately structured and resourced International Office at the University that can hardly provide support for International Students.

As a best practice, (Harvard, MIT, Rutgers and in Cuba) universities have Offices responsible for International Affairs. The Offices are at the level of the Provost (Harvard and MIT) Vice President (Rutgers) and Vice Rector (Cuban Higher Education). This strategically positions the International Affairs Offices to explore linkage between the respective universities and opportunity for collaboration and service delivery beyond the respective country’s borders. These offices are well structured and facilitated to coordinate international Student/Staff study and work exchange programmes, international sponsorships, partnerships and collaborations in programme and delivery, research and professional education. For instance, the International Advisory Committee at MIT chaired by the Provost, designs strategies to target countries and regions where MIT should focus its international efforts and identify cross-cutting themes. Its International Coordinating Committee supports MIT’s administrative offices and functions for international activities. The Committee works closely with the faculty-led International Advisory Committee (IAC) to coordinate international activities.

(4) Admission of Female Students

The Committee noted that McGregor (2007) raised concerns on affirmative action in case of females getting an extra 1.5 points to compete favorably against males in admissions to various undergraduate programmes. This policy is still in place at Makerere University because it has helped increase the female Student enrolment at the University. All other Students are admitted on merit including children of Staff. The University gives a 50% fees waiver for children of Staff members.
The average percentage of female students has remained at 45-46% over the years (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016). Marked variations exist in the science-based disciplines. The College of Engineering Design Art and Technology has the least percentage at 25%, Natural Sciences at 32% and Veterinary Medicine at 33%. For the School of Law, the percentage has reduced from 60% in 2008/09 to 33% by 2015/16. This was largely because of the introduction of the pre-entry examination in 2012/13.

5.4.2.3 Student Identification

At the time of concluding this Report, 1st Year Students (Academic Year 2016-2017) had not obtained University IDs. This was attributed to a shift from the old IT system to the CEMAS mode. With the withdrawal of the CEMAS Project, the University resorted back to the old system and initiated procurement of the service to embark on processing of IDs. At the time of concluding this Report, Students were using their bio-data forms (included photocopies of O’ and A’ level pass slips, copies IDs of previous schools and admission forms) for identification.

5.4.2.4 Graduation Rates and Degrees Awarded

Since 2008 the University started holding one annual graduation ceremony in January. The period 2014-2016, saw an increase in the total number of degrees awarded from 11% in 2014 to 12% in 2016 (Table 5.4.2.4).

Table 5.4.2.4: Students’ Graduation Rates by Level (2014-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>11,366</td>
<td>12,168</td>
<td>12,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,669</td>
<td>13,762</td>
<td>14,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Graduate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Makerere University Fact Book, 2016

The total number of undergraduates who graduated increased from 11,366 in 2014 to 12,727 in 2016. Graduation on Masters’ degree programmes also increased from 442 to 1230 during the same period. The distribution of graduates by discipline was as follows: Business & Economics was 24% in 2008 and 28% in 2016; Humanities was 51% in 2008 and 46% in 2016, while in the S&T it was at 25% in 2008 and rose to 27% in 2016. These statistics were in line with the University’s Strategic Plan (2007/2008-2017/2018) of promoting STI through training graduates who are relevant in a global economy. However, the Committee noted that enrolment [and consequently the graduation rates] of students in Science and Technology was still below the recommended 40% of total enrolment by 2015 (White Paper on Education, 2008).

However, notable in completion and graduation rates were the following:

(1) Very low completion rates at graduate level partly because of heavy supervision loads and an extensive combination of examination models including, but not limited to, internal examination, external examination, independent opponents and examination panels. This implied that the dropout rates were likely to be high and there was a system clog since Students were unable to complete their PhD programmes in the mandatory three years. This affects the resources available per Student and often postpones the delicate process of transition from full-time education to the labour market, thereby reducing labor supply and tax revenues for the Government. The financial implications of extending doctoral candidature beyond the stipulated three-year period is a considerable waste of resources by the University. Doctoral students
spend at least 6-10 years to complete their studies at Makerere University. Although interventions such as capacity development in supervision have been made, these have largely remained ad hoc.

(2) Staff productivity with respect to graduate students had declined from 1.2 in 2008/2009 to 0.9 by 2013/2014 (SSRs). Whereas the number of PhDs had increased, graduate output had declined. Further, there was no proportional increase in the number of students enrolling on doctoral programmes in some of the fields at Makerere University.

(3) Graduate students expressed dissatisfaction with dilapidated teaching facilities and lack of reading space and/or shared office space in case of doctoral students. For instance, a physical visit to CEES (one of the Colleges with the highest Staff to Student Ratio, i.e. 1:72), the Committee found unfurnished lecture space for doctoral students to a level that would not match international standards.

(4) Most of the supervisors in the different disciplinary fields had consultancies and hence created little time for their supervisees. This affected Students’ progress.

(5) The international students expressed lack of awareness of the existence of an International Office in the University, hence misdirecting their requests for student support in case of any challenges.

(6) There was absence of mechanisms to track drop out, completion and graduation rates at Departmental, School and College level.

(7) There was little or no documented evidence of online and offline academic consultations although individual lecturers offered such consultations, especially in the course of supervising graduate students.

5.4.3 Relevance of Academic Programmes

The Committee noted the following:-

(1) There were minimal efforts by the University to address issues of programme duplication and fragmentation. Programme duplication and fragmentation was also reported in the earlier Reports (Omaswa 2014, the White Paper on Education 2008, McGregor 2007).

(2) Since College formation (2011), there has been continuous review of University curriculum, albeit un-streamlined. Following a Presidential directive to review the curriculum, the University Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Programmes Restructuring Committee (2016) whose mandate was on relevance, elimination of duplication, phasing out programmes, and viability, among others. However, the Committee noted that this activity was rather ad hoc and protracted with no clear timelines.

(3) Fragmentation and duplication of undergraduate programmes with no justification based on unique market-value compromised the quality of services (also refer to Omaswa 2014, the White Paper on Education 2008, McGregor 2007). Early specialisation at undergraduate level, for example in Computer Science; IT; Information Systems; or Software Engineering, Computer Engineering at the Bachelors level results into premature specialisation which limits the career growth trajectory for the graduates.

(4) Most of the Masters’ Degree programmes developed had an applied orientation with limited focus on capacity for research.
Despite the fact that the significance of E-learning in strengthening teaching and learning was underscored (Omaswa Report, 2014) this mode of learning had not been fully tapped into by the University. Although a number of programmes has potential to be rolled out using the Distance/Online/E-learning mode, this did not seem to be of utmost importance.

At national level, the Committee noted the following:

1. inadequate involvement of the NCHE and professional bodies in periodic accreditation of the academic systems, structures and programmes at Makerere University.
2. the duplication of academic programmes in public universities in Uganda, with MUBS and COBAMS providing a classical example.

5.4.4 STEM Enrolment, Programmes and Pedagogical Infrastructure

5.4.4.1 The STEM Strategy at National Level

His Excellency the President of the Republic of Uganda and Visitor to Makerere University, in appointing the Visitation Committee to Makerere University in November, 2016, noted that Africans were lagging behind in Science & Technology (S&T) despite the fact that they were the pioneers of civilisation and are sitting atop of incredible natural resources. He emphasised that scholarship should illuminate the causes of and answers to the problems Africans have faced over the past centuries in both the social and natural sciences. He expects scholarship not only to consider the past and present in the wider world but to focus on the problems of Africa and its constituent parts.

Indeed, the world over, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) has been recognised to create critical innovations and to inspire development of solutions to complex problems facing society. Consequently, Government has overtime demonstrated commitment to enhance the current weak legal and regulatory framework to respond to Science, Technology and Innovation (STI). Government has also provided considerable funds to support STI.

To support Government Initiatives in STI, Uganda Vision 2040 and NDP II have provided an environment aimed at enhancing the contribution of STI to wealth creation and employment.

In Vision 2040, para. 262, it was projected that “all Government-supported tertiary education will be devoted to skills development according to the talents and aptitudes identified. Students will be accorded opportunities to excel in whichever skills area they are placed”. Further it was noted in para. 210 that “in an open and highly competitive global economy, the productive sector can only survive by competing through quality, novelty, and a diversity of products and services that can only be generated through innovation and continuous technological change”, while para. 211 highlighted that “S&T has higher rates of returns on investment both in the private and social sectors estimated at 20-30 percent and 50 percent rate of returns respectively”. In the same vein, a key objective of the National Development Plan I (NDP I) was to promote Science, Technology, Innovation and ICT to enhance competitiveness. The NDP II provides that the National Information and Communication Technology (NICT) Policy (2003); the National Biotechnology and Biosafety Policy (2008); and the Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) Policy (2010) establish Government of Uganda (GoU) scientific innovations and value addition funding support mechanisms.

Towards this end, under the Budget Speech for Financial Year 2015/16 the Presidential Initiative to support scientists with an annual allocation of UGX 8 billion to develop and
commercialise local innovations, establish and nurture a number of S&T institutions and enterprises, establish a world class research oversight and regulatory system at the UNCST, and forge international partnership for scientific and technological development was announced.

To enhance the contribution of Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) to wealth creation and employment, NDP II further establishes a need to address the challenges of low technology adoption and diffusion in the development process, the inadequate R&D facilitation, the poor coordination and guidance of Research and Development (R&D) in Uganda and the weak legal and regulatory framework to respond to STI.

Resulting from the above challenges, there are concerns about the way STEM programmes are initiated, developed, executed, monitored and evaluated to produce graduates that suit present day workplace contexts in line with national development goals. McGregor (2007) noted that practical work is crucial in training of S&T Students and requires provision of laboratory/workshop space and materials. However, public universities continue producing scientists/technologists with little practical experience, due to either lack of or inadequate provision of functional laboratory/workshops.

The STEM National Strategy has implications on the way GoU together with her Development Partners will continue to develop education infrastructure for growth of factories, generation of employment in manufacturing high-tech products that define the century and continuous investment in science, engineering research and technology in order to develop new products, businesses and better industries.

5.4.4.2 The STEM Strategy at Makerere University

Research in STEM was documented in the 10-year Strategic Plan 2008/9-2018/19 that envisions Makerere University to be a leading institution for academic excellence and innovations in Africa. The Master Plan Vision for Makerere University is to establish a 6.7-acre campus with capacity to handle 1.5 million students’ research laboratories. This will attract top global biotech and pharmaceutical companies, renowned academic/medical institutions to invest in teaching and delivery of STEM Programmes. The Committee commends the University for such insight and for the achievements registered during the strategic planning period including the following:

(1) There has been progress in STEM overall enrolment at Makerere University from 15% in 2003 to 35% in 2015. However, this is still below 40%, the target recommended by NCHE. There is growth in undergraduate enrolment in all STEM Colleges. Table 5.4.4.2 presents graduate student admissions between the Academic Years 2008/09 and 2015/16.

Table 5.4.2.2: Graduate Student Admissions (2008/09 - 2015/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STEM</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mak</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Affiliates*</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mak</td>
<td>2488</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>2316</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Affiliates*</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Apart from COCIS, all STEM Colleges registered high Graduate Students’ enrolments, CEDAT and CHS registering the highest and CAES the lowest.

b) The percentage of graduate students in STEM Colleges increased from 29.4% 2009/10 to 46.8% 2015/16.

(2) Some STEM Colleges are restructuring their Departments to have more relevant mandates. For instance, the University Council considered a proposal from Senate and approved the restructuring of the Department of Biological Sciences into two new departments, i.e. Department of Plant Sciences, Microbiology and Biotechnology, formerly Botany Unit and Department of Zoology, Entomology and Fisheries Sciences, formerly Zoology Unit. This is commended because it supports the growth of disciplines.

(3) Some STEM Colleges have mounted new short courses deemed relevant for industry. Among these is the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Course in the Department of Disease Control and Environmental Health (MakSPH) targeting individuals working in the WASH sub-sector.

(4) There have been ground-breaking initiatives under the Presidential Initiative on S&T financial support for research and equipment to STEM Colleges as highlighted in Section 5.6 of this Report.

(5) Some Science-based Colleges are experimenting with various innovative pedagogies such as:

a) adoption of e-learning approaches to teaching and learning;

b) students’ extension services to various sectors/communities;

c) the problem-based learning/community based education curriculum adopted by CHS since 2004. This approach to learning stimulates students’ interests to consider working in rural areas; and

d) the Community Based Education Research and Service (COBERS) model by CHS aimed at exposing students to the public health and primary health care needs of rural communities early and throughout their education, while fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and self-directed learning.

Despite the above achievements and other milestones, the successful implementation of STEM Programmes is encumbered by multiple challenges including the following:

(1) A number of STEM Colleges were still using the 2010/2011 programme structures. For instance, the Department of Mathematics still offered the MSc. Mathematics and MSc. Mathematical Modeling despite Senate’s recommendation to merge the two programmes.

(2) Delays in the internal programme restructuring processes at Departmental, School, College and Senate levels. For instance, the Department of Plant Sciences was still using the old curriculum of 2010-2011 because the programme restructured in 2014 was cleared at College but not at Senate level.

(3) Dilapidated and obsolete science-related infrastructure and equipment (as is highlighted later in Section 5.4.9 of this Report);

(4) Lack of chemicals for experiments;
(5) While the Makerere Fact Book (2016) provides teaching and laboratory space by College, there is inadequate information on the status of teaching/laboratory equipment and materials.

(6) The number of computers as noted in the Fact Book has been declining from 5,786 (2012/13) to 2,637 (2015/16). This is due to poor maintenance and replacement amidst increasing usage of IT.

(7) Theoretical delivery of STEM Programmes due to (3) and (4) above in addition to the high Student to Lecturer/Technician ratios.

(8) Very limited information on Students’ projects, innovations and intellectual property rights.

(9) Lack of documented information on Academic Projects in some STEM Colleges in spite of the presence of several internationally-acknowledged Centres of Excellence.

5.4.5 Management of Teaching and Learning Processes

The Committee noted the following:

(1) Inadequate monitoring of teaching and learning processes. The evaluation done at the end of each Semester was untimely and the feedback is not used to improve teaching and learning.

(2) Some full-time staff were not fulfilling their teaching obligations. The quality of teaching and learning was also affected by academic staff in some Colleges not meeting their workload, i.e. the 10 hours per week (Kabaasa, 2013: 4). Kabaasa (2013) recommended that all senior academic staff including professors should teach both on graduate and undergraduate level, especially, first years. Indeed, from the consultative meetings the Committee held with some of the Top Management Officials, the Senior members of Academic staff especially at professor level leave most of the teaching to junior staff, especially at undergraduate level.

(3) Lack of institutionalised capacity enhancement programmes for lecturers in management of teaching and assessment; especially teaching and assessing using learner-centred and competence-based and e-pedagogy approaches. However, there have been ad hoc approaches or project-based initiatives coordinated by the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs) and other actors in the University.

(4) Heavy reliance on more theory-based than hands-on training; leading to knowledge and skills gaps as well as low productivity among by fresh graduates reported in NCHE (2013) tracer study;

(5) Limited teaching and study space, the conversion of laboratories into lecture rooms (e.g. in COVAB), dilapidated and ill-equipped laboratories, lack of the basic essentials for teaching and learning,

(6) High student to staff as well as student/staff to technician ratios in some Colleges, i.e. CEES, COBAMS, COCIS, CHUSS, CEDAT and the School of Law in comparison to the recommended NCHE Staff to Student Ratios (SSR).

5.4.6 The Internship Programme

The Internship Programme was adopted by Makerere University for all undergraduate programmes. The University’s Internship and Apprenticeships Policy and Guidelines guides the processes and skills development for undergraduates and improvement of engagements and partnerships with industry. The 4-8 weeks long internship placement provides practical
learning opportunities in real life settings for 2nd and 3rd and on some programmes 4th year undergraduate Students. The Program also affords research opportunities for Staff and enhances partnership between the University and Industry during the co-supervision of Students. However, as recommended in the Omaswa Report (2014), the University is yet to review the Internship Programme to address significant reforms in mind-set and attitude change, financing, supervision and relevance of the academic programmes to the labour market.

In addition, through its interaction with the Uganda Manufacturers’ Association (UMA) and Private Sector Foundation, the Committee noted the following general concerns about the Internship Programme:

1. Lack of Government Policy on internship/industrial placements that would provide incentives to industries to be encouraged to take on more Students and Academic Staff. UMA placements and facilitation of fresh graduates in industry under the AfDB V HEST Project is a welcome arrangement.

2. Students on internship generally lack employability skills, i.e. soft skills, communication skills, maintaining equipment, time management, attitude towards work, etc.

3. Students on internship lack adequate knowledge and practical skills required in industry.

4. Nature and level of supervision is wanting with little or no follow up on Internship Reports by Makerere University and Industry. There is no forum for discussing such reports to improve Students’ learning experiences during Internship.

5.4.7 Management of Assessment and Examinations

The Committee recognises the following good practices in the management of assessment and examinations at Makerere University:

1. Availability of a comprehensive Examinations Policy guiding the management of assessment and examinations in the University. As observed in the Semester I, 2016/17 examination diet, examination papers were moderated, there were marking guides for undergraduate examinations, the examinations were supervised and the candidates registered on the examination attendance lists.

2. Availability of other policies supporting the management of assessment and examination processes including policies related to Learning and Teaching, Academic Integrity, Professional Integrity Standards, Space Allocation and Utilisation, and Record Management.

3. Attempts to balance theory and practice by assessing and examining students’ performance both in written, oral (in some cases), internships, industrial attachments, projects, etc., as deemed relevant by individual Colleges.

4. The University has also undertaken several investigations into examination malpractices. At the time of writing this Report, the University had halted issuance of transcripts to Students following gross allegations of malfeasance with suspected Staff arrested.

However, a number of challenges and irregularities related to coursework and examinations were noted by the Committee, critical among these were the following:-

1. Reluctance by Senior Academic Staff to invigilate examinations,
(2) Poor accountability by Internal Examiners, partly due to the fact that the part times administer, mark and enter Students’ results,

(3) Inadequate attention paid to coursework and other forms of continuous assessment, yet this contributed 40% of the final mark. Heads of Departments (HoDs) left the administration of coursework to individual Lecturers.

(4) The Committee notes that students pay an annual Examination Fee of UGX 100,000. However, the University faces perennial logistical challenges such as:
   a) lack of/inadequate apparatus, equipment and specimens. Where these were available, they were shared by the candidates;
   b) inadequate rooms for examinations; and
   c) lack of transportation vehicles for examinations.

(5) Examination malpractices (also noted in Omaswa, 2014). The Committee identified the following forms of malpractices, some of which have attracted media attention:
   a) gross allegations of Staff (Academic and AR) malfeasance in results management with questionable action by Management. The allegations included, examination leakages, negligent invigilation, misplacement of marks either due to negligence or deliberately, alteration of marks by for instance hacking into the examination and records system, smuggling ineligible Students onto the graduation list, soliciting money or sex from Students who fail papers and offering to change the results.
   b) Students are alleged to participate in the following malpractices: duplicating others’ written course works, cheating during the examinations due to congested rooms; and exchanging favors for marks either voluntarily or through coercion.
   c) Staff memos submitted to the Visitation Committee indicated that Management was generally adamant when such malpractices were reported. Staff who were often implicated in these malpractices were transferred to other University Units.

(6) Perennial delay in marking and releasing of marks, which has led to demonstrations by Students. The marking and processing of Semester Examinations spilled over into the next Semester. This contravenes the semester model.

(7) Processing of Students’ results through several hands, some of whom are part time Staff.

(8) Delayed feedback that hinders Students’ learning improvement, due to inadequate supervision by Heads of Departments, high Students to Lecturer ratios in some Colleges, delayed Staff salaries, and poor remuneration, among others.

(9) Inadequate space in Colleges and Academic Registrar’s Office to safely store examination materials to the extent that office and lecture space has been encroached upon.

(10) Academic records at Makerere University are highly risk-prone due to the use of outmoded records archiving methods, space shortage, poor storage facilities, and lack of surveillance systems and firefighting equipment.

(11) Most of the staff in the Office of the AR were to retire in 10 years from now, however, there was low recruitment and promotion of AR staff. At the time of the
visit, some senior AR Staff were acting in more than 3 offices, the Examination Division and the Ceremonies Division had no substantive Heads, and some Divisions did not have secretaries. There were only two data entrants (on contract) in the Office of the AR. Over 60% of the Staff were either in acting capacity or temporary. The Colleges without data entrants included; COCIS, CHS, CEDAT, COVAB, CAES, MUBS, and Upcountry Centres. The College Registrar: Student ratio ranged between 1: 900/1,000. Consequently, due to staff capacity challenges, the AR’s Office focused more on undergraduate than graduate programmes.

(12) While the policy stipulates that no administrative, support or contract Staff should handle Students’ results, most Staff capturing Students’ results were temporary, e.g. in COBAMS, 8 of the 9 AR Staff were part time whose monthly salary came 2-3 months late. Some of them had worked for over 10 years on contract, contrary to the HR Policy. Using demotivated part time staff to manage results raises integrity questions.

(13) The inadequate capacity building of AR Staff to handle emerging challenges also affected their promotion, especially Staff in the Records Section who had worked for over 20 years.

Noteworthy, the Students cited the management of examination results as the second leading cause of their discontent at Makerere University (ref. to Chapter Six of this Report). The inadequate management of assessment and examinations is perhaps the biggest challenge to the integrity of the entire academic system. This has continuously bedeviled the image of the University.

5.4.8 The Management of Academic Records at Makerere University

5.4.8.1 Structure of the Office of the Academic Registrar

The Office of the Academic Registrar (AR assists the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic Affairs) in the coordination of all academic matters including Administration, Undergraduate studies, Postgraduate studies, Examinations, Syllabi, and Research and Publications. The Office is headed by the Academic Registrar, who is assisted by Deputy Registrar (Senate Division), Ag. Deputy Registrar (Undergraduate Admissions and Records Division), Ag. Deputy Registrar (Examinations & Transcript Division), Ag. Head of Transcripts Section, Deputy Registrar (Graduate Studies), and Deputy Registrar (Certificates and Ceremonies). Academic registry services have been decentralised in that each of the nine Colleges, the School of Law and MUBS has a Registrar. However, some Colleges have over one thousand Students and several programmes, which pose challenges to the College Academic Registrars. The Office of the AR which is the Secretary to Senate and its Committees oversees the implementation of several policies approved by Senate. The AR’s Office is also Secretary to the University Convocation (Association of Staff and the University Alumni).

5.4.8.2 Management of Academic Records

During the tour of the facilities, the Committee noted that storage facilities for Students’ academic records were grossly inadequate and very risk-prone. The records were scattered in Senate Building leading to encroachment on office, lecture and corridor space. Transcripts were kept in small exposed boxes. There was absence of Registry and Archival facilities for shelving, in addition to lack of cameras, First Aid Boxes, and detective facilities in case of fire.
5.4.8.3 Resources and Funds for the Office of the AR

The resources and funds to effectively deliver academic services were inadequate. Further, high taxes are levied on the importation of transcript blanks. For instance, URA levies Makerere USh70 millions on 50,000 imported transcript blanks. The Committee notes that bodies such as UNEB do not pay taxes. This was coupled with Staff salary discrepancies and poor remuneration of Staff in the Office of the AR.

5.4.8.4 Governance Issues in the Office of the AR

(1) The provision in UOTIA 2001 as amended, results into a role conflict between the AR and the DVCAA offices.

(2) Management was alleged to interfere with the smooth running of the Office of the AR. For instance, the deadlines on registration, fees payment, and issuance of examination permits set as policy were on several occasions lifted by Management to mitigate strikes.

(3) The promotions and appointments procedures were noted to be faulted. Some Staff were alleged to be appointed where the structures did not exist. For example, the College Web Administrators and Communication Offices were on first appointment with a Bachelor’s degree put on M5 scale equivalent to Senior Lecturers.

(4) Low integrity of some of the Staff in the AR’s Office were reported. Some were noted to alter Students’ marks and academic records at a fee, and some Staff were suspended. Although there are guidelines on examination management, there was lack of a policy framework to regulate change of marks and apprehend AR Staff for falsifying records (ICT Abuse) from admission to graduation. The changing of marks is noted to have started in 2011, some AR Staff viewed these mistakes are deliberate, which calls for investigation. The Examination Malpractice Reports from the Senate Committee on Examinations were not returned to the AR to implement Senate recommendations.

5.4.9 University Facilities and Equipment

Government intervention to improve pedagogical facilities at public universities under the Presidential Initiative in S&T and the AfDB V HEST Infrastructure Development Programme has greatly complemented infrastructural developments in public universities. Specifically, at Makerere University, such intervention comes at a time when the students’ enrolment is high amidst un-expanded infrastructure. Through the AfDB V HEST Infrastructure Development Programme, 16000m² will be made available to Makerere University as central teaching space (14 lecture rooms) and 34 offices, 1 E-learning lab, 2 Boardrooms, and 7 breakaway rooms, 3 Auditoriums, 1 meeting room).

5.4.9.1 Space and equipment

The Makerere University Infrastructure Master Plan, 2014 indicates a deficiency in teaching and laboratory space. The teaching space comprises lecture theatres/rooms seminar rooms and laboratories. Central Space is lecture space available in the Senate Building, St. Francis and St. Augustine Students’ Centres. In 2014/2015 the Main Hall ceased being a central teaching space, further creating space shortage. The general analysis of space requirements per Students is below the acceptable standards with COBAMS, SoL, CEES and CHUSS running below acceptable levels of 0.16 m², 0.27m², 0.25m² and 0.28m² per student, respectively.

Therefore, the successful implementation of quality academic Programmes is encumbered by multiple space-related challenges, which create an unfriendly study environment. The
congestion and poor service delivery are likely causes of frustration, which predispose the University community to discontent and strikes. The challenges included:

1. dilapidated, unexpanded and un-fumigated infrastructure (lecture rooms and theaters, conference rooms, tutorial rooms, demonstration rooms, laboratories, workshops, College libraries, sanitary facilities, office space, staff rooms, tea rooms, sanitary facilities, staff quarters and halls of residence). Most of these buildings have been in existence since colonial days; and some still have asbestos roofs, which are a health hazard to the University community. The physical infrastructure has not increased in tandem with the needs of the enlarged student and staff population.

2. Jinja Off-Shore Campus is ill-facilitated and equipped to prepare quality graduates.

3. inadequate budget at the Centre and in the Colleges for simple repair and maintenance. This coupled with a poor maintenance culture has resulted into a general dilapidation of the institutional physical infrastructure and equipment. Noteworthy, students pay an annual Development Fee of UGX 123,500, which money could be used for repair and maintenance.

4. the repurposing of laboratories and other practical learning spaces and tutorial rooms into lecture rooms to create space for the increasing programmes and students; with the example of CONAS and COVAB.

5. the available infrastructure and equipment inventories indicate presence of lecture rooms, demonstration rooms, computer laboratories and other technical rooms which do not match the overwhelming students’ number. Consequently, practical sessions are taught theoretically. Noteworthy, students pay an annual Technology Fee of UGX 50,000, which money could be used maintenance and purchase teaching and learning facilities and equipment.

6. poor management, therefore under-utilisation of training facilities at Buyana (Veterinary) and Kabanyolo (Agriculture). Some of the land has been encroached upon, and the custodianship of the land titles is unclear. During its tour, the Committee noted a secondary school had been constructed on Kabanyolo land. The animals at Buyana used for surgery experiments had been over-cut and were no longer useful for teaching or fit for eating. The Students on practicum in Buyana resided in facilities which do not meet the minimum requirements for accommodation of scholars.

7. majority of the laboratory equipment was non-functional and has not been replaced. Further, there was a

8. general lack of chemicals and specimen for experiments, as well as poor storage facilities in the Science-based Colleges (CHS, COVAB, CAES, CONAS, and CEDAT). The net effect of this scenario is that Students cannot undertake the prescribed number of laboratory practical sessions in each semester.

9. limited up-country resource Centres such as Kibaale Field Station.

10. there were limited Vehicles for most Departments with a field work component.

5.4.9.2 The Library

1. A new library extension was constructed and this has subsequently increased the central seating capacity by 50%, digital library space (full text records) increased to 3009 in 2015/16 from 407 in 2008/09, digital music archives from 1577 in 2008/09 to 3513 in 2015/16 (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016).
The central library space is complimented by additional libraries at CAES, COBAMS, CEES CHUSS, CEDAT, COVAB, Albert Cook at CHS and at the Makerere Agricultural Research Institute in Kabanyolo.

The e-books have tremendously increased in the library collections, and the book bank collections, library collections, and print journals have increased by 44%, 12% and 10%, respectively over the period.

However, the Committee noted the following:-

1. While there has been a marked increase in access to online resources, there is an acute shortage of books and periodicals.
2. The College libraries were too small to handle the current number of Students.
3. The student: book ratio standing at 1:7 in the 2015/16 academic year is far below the accepted ratio of 1:20 (NCHE QA Framework, 2011).
4. Although Students paid an annual library fee (UGX 20,000), this money was not ring-fenced to support Library activities. This money was put in a central pool to pay staff incentive.

Both the McGgregor (2007) and Omaswa (2014) Reports indicate that the library services are under-funded, therefore below standards of a modern University. According to McGgregor (2007) the funding of libraries in public universities ranges between 1.3% and 5% of the annual University expenditure.

5.4.9.3 Computers

1. The computer facilities in Colleges have been reducing over the years from 5786 (2011/12) to 2637 (2015/16) (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016).
2. A visit to all Colleges revealed limited availability of facilities to enable e-learning integration. For example, COCIS had 304 desktop computers, 269 of which were reported obsolete. There were 386 thin clients but only 120 were in working conditions. This brought the total working computers in COCIS to 424. With a population of about 3500 students, the ratio of computers to students stood at 1:8 against the National Council for Higher Education benchmark of 1:2. The College had 31 overhead projectors used for teaching, which were inadequate.
3. There were 150 computers in CONAS distributed in three computer laboratories. The computer to student ratio also stood at 1:8. In COVABS, there were four computer laboratories with a total of 140 computers, some of which were non-functional. COVABS had 8 projectors used for teaching. The computer to student ratio in COVAB stood at 1:10.
4. Limited stocks available for teaching and learning with some computer software such as LATEX, MATLAB, SPSS and MAPLE which are mainly used by postgraduate students for data analysis.
5. Vandalism and theft of computers in various Colleges have dogged the University over the years. These have not been replaced to meet the increasing student population over time.
5.5 **RECOMMENDATIONS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING**

5.5.1 **Admissions, Enrolment and Graduation Rates**

The University should:

1. fast track the installation and operationalisation of a robust home-grown Student Integrated Information System to manage applications, admissions, registration, identification, examinations, grading and certification. Kyambogo University is managing these processes using the home-grown *e-Kampus*.

2. issue students with IDs at least a month after registration. The IDs should have versatile affordances. For instance, at the University of Witwatersrand, IDs are used to access the University facilities, thereby controlling strikes.

3. strengthen the Office of the AR in terms of capacity to be able to efficiently and effectively handle students’ applications through to certification processes. This will require the University Council to either recruit or regularise appointment of temporary Staff to replace Staff who have resigned or died, as well as have these (re-)trained to handle these sensitive processes.

4. develop Staff capacity based on an approved Human Resource Plan.

5. continue to gradually reduce admissions in Business, Arts and Humanities disciplines since these disciplines are offered in other universities in Uganda. The admission cut-off points could be revised upwards so that the University takes good A’ level students.

6. annually increase admissions for undergraduate students in STEM-related disciplines to meet the recommended 40% of total enrolment, which was projected for 2015 (White Paper on McGregor, Visitation Committee to Public Universities in 2008).

7. continue implementing the affirmative action (the extra 1.5 points) to enable female students compete favorably against their male counterparts in admissions to various undergraduate programmes.

8. in a bid to strengthen quality at entry level consider entry examinations for all professional course as it is in the School of Law.

9. strengthen the University International Office to play its key role in linking the University with the outside world, in forging partnerships and collaborations in teaching, research and innovations, and KTPs, and in marketing the University’s academic programmes. Several universities visited during the benchmarking exercise by the Committee are interested in these partnerships and collaborations.

10. establish Units at College-level to coordinate College-specific international affairs. These Units should report to the Central International Office.

11. in order to increase graduate student admissions, retention and completion rates;
   a) improve on intake; but also consider double admission;
   b) improve the graduate training processes to ensure retention;
   c) improve the graduate training facilities;
   d) improve research supervision processes to ensure timely completion and graduation rates;
e) use ICT as a pedagogical enabler through online course provision and e-campus development;

f) lobby for and introduce scholarships (grants and loans) for graduate students;

g) tag funds from the Presidential Science Initiative and from other Grants to graduate training;

h) ensure that University Research Projects have a graduate training component;

i) target the nationally recommended 40% total enrolment on STEM Programmes.

j) consider benchmarking from the universities, for instance in India, which in a bid to strengthen quality at entry level, qualifying students sit University entry examinations based on various guidelines.

k) continuously track dropout and completion rates to improve graduate training and research.

(12) Government should put in place a competitive Research Fund for Graduate Students and Staff.

5.5.2 Restructuring of Academic Programmes

The University should in the short to medium term:-

(1) ensure that professional bodies, industry and employers are actively engaged in the restructuring process, and that the restructured programmes are relevant to the national development agenda.

(2) review the Internship Programme during programme re-structuring to enrich students’ learning experiences. Further, as noted in the Omaswa Report (2014), the Internship Programme could benefit the University by students practicing various skills within the University premises relevant to their courses.

(3) set clear timelines on conclusion of the ongoing programmes restructuring process at Makerere University addressing fragmentation, duplication and relevance of programmes.

(4) run more academic programmes using the Distance/Blended/E-learning mode, especially at Masters and PhD levels. In addition to the two fully-fledged online learning programmes, namely: Bachelor of Youth Development Work and Masters in Instructional Design and Technology current distance learning programmes should, in the short run, be fully transformed into blended learning programmes with fulltime online facilitation. The programmes are:

a) Bachelor of Commerce (External)

b) Bachelor of Education (External)

c) Bachelor of Science (External)

d) Bachelor of Agricultural and Rural Innovation (External)

e) Master of Public Health (Distance)

(5) consider transforming cross-cutting PhD programmes into blended learning courses to be offered as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCS).
given that most Masters’ degree programmes aim at imparting research skills and are more problem-oriented, it is imperative that each College develops a strong professional doctorate alongside the existing doctoral degrees of philosophy. This may appropriately meet the needs of professionals who enroll on existing doctoral degrees but delay because of a high proportion of theory as compared to application. The professional doctorates have potential to generate relevant and timely solutions to existing problems in the broader socio-economic environment.

ensure that each College periodically undertakes Graduate Tracer Studies to inform curriculum development and review in relation to the contemporary knowledge and skills required in industry.

with over 46 universities in Uganda and in line with her Strategic Plan 2007/8-2017/18, Makerere University should leverage her premier position in the higher education ecosystem to focus on graduate training and research so as to provide higher education human resource for the Nation, as well as improve Uganda’s contribution to the research and innovations index, which is currently low.

currently, the training of Postgraduate Students is left to private and donor funding leading to very low output. Government should resume funding for Postgraduate Students.

current accreditation processes by the NCHE are commended, but could further be improved using the peer review and assessment model in the USA. The outcomes of the Report from the Professional Peers from other universities should determine whether the programmes should receive accreditation from NCHE. No programme accreditation would imply no government funds for the Students offering a specific programme.

The Line Ministry should:

a) set up an inter-university working group for National Curriculum Mapping to study the status of the current academic programmes in all public universities and restructure them in accordance to the national human resource requirements, the Uganda National Qualifications Framework, the East African Qualifications Framework, NDPII and Vision 2040. International frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) should guide the restructuring of the University’s academic programmes.

In the mapping exercise, the mandate of each public university should be reviewed considering its endowment in terms of current and potential capacity and resources.

Curriculum mapping is one means of ensuring that graduate attributes and employability skills, are given an appropriate focus, are discipline-nuanced and aligned with the country human resource requirements. This involves tapping into technical, professional and work-related requirements. This national exercise will respond to the perennial challenges related to course duplication, fragmentation and relevance in public universities.

b) review the Higher Education Strategic Plan to include succinct and time-bound strategic actions for promoting blended education in Uganda.

5.5.3 STEM Enrolment, Programmes and Pedagogical Infrastructure

Government is commended for initiating and overseeing the implementation of the Secondary Science Education and Mathematics (SESEMAT) Programme; and that 2,000 teachers will be trained and 120 science kits distributed to secondary schools in the FY 2017/18.

The Committee also noted Government commitment to supporting the implementation of the BTVET Strategic Plan (2012/13 – 2022/23) through which 90 of the 116 Districts have at least a BTVET Institution. Plans to set up of Technical Institutions in each Constituency are also commended.

Government is further commended for setting up the Higher Education Students’ Financing Board (HESFB) to increase equitable access to higher education and support qualifying students who may not afford the cost of higher education in Uganda.

In the mid-term, Government should support continuously improvement of students’ enrolment to STEM Programmes, the STEM content, delivery and infrastructure by:

1. extending the affirmative funding for S&T to the basic levels of education (primary and secondary) as well as PTCs and NTCs to widen catchment for S&T in higher education, and by making the BTVET subsector more attractive.

2. strengthening and country-wide rolling out the SESEMAT programmes to enhance teacher effectiveness in teaching of Science and Mathematics in Secondary Schools.

3. undertaking a national study to assess the impact of the SESEMAT Programme and distribution of Science Kits on the quality of teaching and learning Science and Mathematics and the graduates from Secondary Schools.

4. creating a conducive environment for graduates to set up industries through strong PPPs.

5. increasing HESFB funding so that more students qualifying to study under the STEM programmes in higher education institutions can access the loan. For instance, as illustrated in Table 5.5.3 in FY 2016/17 of the 671 students applied for the students’ loan to study Human Medicine, only 214 received the loan, 102 applied to do Health Care Management Sciences, only 42 received the loan (HESFB, 2017), implying a demand/supply imbalance. The Committee was informed by the Officers at the Ministry of Education and Sports that there are ceilings on admissions based on the enrolment capacity of the qualifying institutions on several STEM Programmes.

Table 5.5.3: Student Loan Applications and Beneficiaries FY 2016/17 by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Applicants (No.)</th>
<th>Beneficiaries (No.)</th>
<th>Gender (No.)</th>
<th>Share by Discipline (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human Medicine</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Healthcare Management Science</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pharmacy &amp; Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Laboratory Science Programmes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Petroleum &amp; Geoscience Engineering</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pure Science</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,764</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HESFB, 2017
In the short to mid-term, the University should:

1. Develop a STEM Strategy to address the quality, relevance and delivery of current STEM programmes.

2. Continuously invest in appropriate STEM laboratories and equipment, including Internet and Virtual-Labs in view of the advances in S&T.

3. Strengthen career guidance at basic and higher education levels through streamlined academic advisory and counseling services at the University with relevant outreach programmes to Secondary Schools.

4. Support the vision of the Science-based Colleges to build specialised laboratories and clinics with highly specialised laboratory equipment for both pedagogical and commercial purposes. This could be done through PPPs.

5. Reward and recognise individual lecturers experimenting with various innovative pedagogies and other forms of outstanding academic achievements. This is in line with the provisions of the Makerere University Staff Awards and Recognition Policy ratified in December 2014.

6. The benchmarking visit to the University of Witwatersrand points to the existence of the Vice-Chancellor’s Teaching Awards for teaching excellence and the Vice-Chancellor’s Academic Citizenship Awards for members who have made a substantial, significant, and innovative contribution to one or more of the communities which they serve as academic citizens. Such practices could support the strategic direction of the University towards learner-centred pedagogy.

7. Establish Science and Technology Parks.

5.5.4 Implementation of Academic Programmes

The continuous improvement in the quality of education will require concerted effort as follows:-

1. The DVC AA as the academic leader should ensure that staff managing academic affairs are sensitised about the existing academic policies, the policies are availed to them, as well as monitor and evaluate policy implementation.

2. Senate should develop detailed academic procedures for policies that lack these to enable smooth implementation of such policies.

3. Each College should periodically undertake Graduate Tracer Studies to inform curriculum development and review in relation to the contemporary knowledge and skills required in industry, improve teaching and learning, and establish employment opportunities for her fresh graduates.

4. Strengthening the Academic Core: Academic Departments are the foundations for the birth and growth of academic disciplines. Academic freedom is best realised under a decentralised and less bureaucratic system, implying that Staff have the primary responsibility for advancing the University’s academic purposes by collectively ensuring quality teaching, learning, research and scholarship appropriate to the University’s mission. Like in the USA universities, Makerere University should seek to protect and support the growth of her academic departments by empowering them to:-

   a) develop, implement and evaluate their academic targets, which should be shared at College level.
b) manage and be held accountable for the academic affairs of the respective Departments.

c) monitor and evaluate the quality of education and training.

d) engage in continuous self-assessment and peer review mechanisms to nurture and sustain a quality culture. The Peer Review Plans are guided by the Department's instructional needs and aspirations.

e) manage academic records.

f) identify and recruit competent faculty.

g) attract funds to nurture teaching, scholarship, research and innovation.

The above should be used as some of the measures by which staff and departments are annually appraised.

(5) The Centre for Teaching and Learning Support established during the College Framework to be managed by CEES has not taken off due to capacity and financial limitations. The Centre was to build staff capacity in teaching and learning. Since the Centre does not have an academic mandate, it should be reduced to an Administrative Unit, to work with an academic unit mandated in teaching scholarship, for example the East African School of Higher Education Studies and Development in the College of Education and External Studies (EASHESD-CEES). The Centre should work under the office of the DVC AA who should attract funds to manage the Centre. The University of Kwa Zulu Natal provides a good case study.

(6) All serving and prospective Academic Staff (including doctoral Students since they aspire to become Academic Staff) should be trained in Higher Education Pedagogy. This would build strong pedagogical and andragogical competences. The programme will include four modules: teaching and learning in higher education, assessment and evaluation in higher education, curriculum design and development in higher education, and graduate research supervision.

(7) All serving and prospective Academic Staff (including doctoral Students since they aspire to become Academic Staff/potential Heads of Department or Deans) should be trained in Higher Education Leadership and Management. This would build strong Academic Leadership and Management competences.

(8) The EASHESD in the CEES should coordinate further development and delivery of the Higher Education Pedagogy Programme in Makerere University since the Master of Higher Education with specialisations of Teaching and Learning, Leadership and Management, and Research and Innovation was approved by Senate in May 2017.

(9) Deliberately invest in and prioritise funding for innovative teaching, and staff engaged in innovative pedagogies including the development of software for improved teaching and learning should be recognised and rewarded.

a) The software should be patented and commercialised.

b) The University should establish partnerships with other organisations and industries to develop software for them. As it is in some Colleges, students should be involved in the development of competitive software.

c) The Committee notes two examples from its benchmarking mission:-
   i. Harvard University has an Office of Technology Development (OTD) responsible for overseeing the development,
licensing and implementation of technology and ensuring that the IP Policy is implemented with respect to inventions, software and other materials that arise from the University’s teaching and research activities.

ii. The University of Informatics in Cuba commercialises technology innovations as one of its major sources of revenue. The University has developed and commercialised several software products for education, the banking sector, agriculture, and telecommunication in addition to exporting technical services as consultancies abroad.

(10) Build 21st classrooms and laboratories worth a 21st Century University equipped with state of the art educational hardware and software.

(11) The effectiveness of teaching should be periodically and systematically assessed by the Directorate of Quality Assurance using valid procedures; and the feedback should be formatively used to improve teaching and learning. Students’ assessment of teaching and learning should be at College level, and the College-level assessments should further be processed by the Directorate of QA to provide University-wide strategic direction.

(12) Strengthen the Quality Assurance Directorate to have presence in all Colleges and ensure that the services given to Staff, Students and other stakeholders meet the required standards. Quality assurance should take a holistic view to ensure that Staff are empowered to deliver and the environment is conducive for Students to learn. The QA Units at College level should be strengthened to monitor and evaluate the quality of teaching and learning.

(13) The currently high Student to Lecturer ratios should be reduced based on the NCHE standards so that Lecturers can have more time to engage in advising students, and to scholarship, service and loyalty to institutional mission, research and creative activity. The results of these evaluations should be used to enhance fulfillment of the University vision and mission.

(14) Current efforts to fundraise for a Makerere University Students’ Centre are commendable. In future, Colleges with big numbers of students need modern Students’ Centres with internet points, restaurants, and bookshops, among others.

(15) Set up a University Career Service Centre to link students, graduates, employers and industry to equip students with the right tools and essential skills they need to fulfill their career ambitions. The Centre should work closely with employers, by creating a mutually beneficial relationship which helps them match their recruitment needs and helps students meet their career aspirations. The University should organise annual Careers Fairs.

(16) Colleges should make effort to link their students to industry and to bring adjuncts from industry in their classrooms. Activities such as company visits, career advisory services, mentoring workshops, recruitment fares, forums, on-campus interviews, weekly talks on soft skills, internship workshops, Resume critiques, interview skills and grooming workshops should be organised at College level.

(17) Integrate the Buyana (Veterinary) and Kabanyolo (Agriculture) facilities into its Master Plan and fully utilise these.

(18) Set up a University Museum coordinated by the Department of Archeology.
In order to continuously improve teaching and learning, the University should:-

a) encourage Academic Staff to engage in action research to improve teaching and learning.

b) fully adopt a learner-centred competence-based model of teaching and learning (linking theory to work practice) and train staff to use the model.

c) strengthen the Employer and Industry link in skills development.

d) strengthen and expand the Online/Blended/e-Learning infrastructure, space and human resource (also ref. to Omaswa, 2014). Using the Online/Blended/e-Learning approach will: afford the University to tap into the expertise of world-renowned professors, researchers and scholars who can reach students at anytime from anywhere; put away space pressures from the limited brick-and-mortar infrastructure at the Main Campuses; and curtail rampant strikes because few students are on the Main Campus.

e) integrate e-learning in the teaching and learning processes in all Colleges by having all courses on conventional programmes using MUELE at least as a digital content repository. This should be fully tapped with the support of the AfDB V HEST Project, which is expanding ICT facilities and competence at the University.

f) establish a Central Blended Learning Unit to support the development and growth of blended education at Makerere University as it is elsewhere (e.g. University of Nairobi and Kenyatta University in Kenya; University of Pretoria in South Africa; University of Namibia in Namibia; and Dalarna University in Sweden).

g) continuously invest in and integrate current generation educational technology and e-learning pedagogy in teaching and learning to reduce the digital gap and develop knowledge products.

The Committee noted increased donor interest in open, distance and e-learning – for example, NORAD is supporting Makerere University to the tune of USD 3 million to leapfrog its 1st generation distance education into 4th and 5th generation distance education. Makerere University is also participating in the ‘Partnership for Enhanced and Blended Learning (PEBL)’ project, a DFID partnership of Six (6) universities in East Africa, funded to the tune of GBK 2 million.

1) offer training for students to create their personal brand and profile that elevates their opportunities for employability.

2) establish collaborations with professional networks such as LinkedIn, to leverage their powerful connections.

The NCHE should streamline the accreditation as well as monitoring and evaluation processes at public universities.

5.5.5 Management of Assessment and Examinations

5.5.5.1 Assessment and Examination Policy and Practice

Makerere University should restore the glory of its academic quality by strengthening and conscientiously guarding the quality and management of assessment and examinations through a number of strategies including the following:
(1) The recommendations by Omaswa (2014) to review the examination practices to address malpractices that have marred the quality of qualifications have not been fully addressed.

(2) Fast tracking the process of developing a University Statute where the several approved policies are gazetted. This will further improve the regulation of the academic systems and processes including assessment and examinations.

(3) **Compliance with the Examinations Policy:** Management should ensure that Staff and Students involved in various forms of examination malpractices are apprehended.

(4) Senate should annually audit the examination systems and processes.

(5) The Students Guild should set up a female-student support system to deal with any suspected cases of female students who face sexual demands from the few unscrupulous Academic Staff in exchange for better marks.

(6) **Supervision and invigilation:**
   a) The administration of Coursework should be well-supervised at Departmental level.
   b) Masters’ degree and PhD Students should be deployed to support the invigilation of undergraduate examinations.
   c) More room should be allotted for examinations to reduce congestion.
   d) Security cameras should be installed in large halls to aid in the supervision of examinations.

(7) **Marking and processing of semester examinations:**
   a) Marking and processing of semester examinations should be expedited as per policy so that students receive their results in time to seek guidance and make informed decisions.
   b) The policy on centralised marking should be supported and implemented at College level to expedite the processing of results and to secure the integrity of submitted scripts.

(8) **Logistical Support:**
   a) The Examination Fee of UGX 100,000 paid by students annually should be ring-fenced for this purpose.
   b) The Academic Registrar’s Department should provide necessary supervisory structures at the Centre and at College level in terms of regulatory and budget compliance and strategic oversight for the running of examinations.
   c) The Directorate of Research & Graduate Training (DRGT) should work closely with the Colleges to ensure close supervision of graduate programmes with respect to the quality of course work, examinations and research supervision.
   d) There is urgent need to allocate resources to purchase laboratory equipment, reagents and specimen. With a decentralised budget, the Colleges can ring-fence the funds for examinations.

(9) The current strategy to have College ARs enter marks centrally under a controlled environment (Senate Building) with cameras may reduce changing of marks.
However, more permanent measures need to be devised to ensure that the entire management of results is fraud-proof, right from the Academic Departments to the Office of the AR. This is because College Registrars have other assignments at College, which may restrict their movement to and from Senate.

(10) **Nature and quality and of examinations:**

- **a)** With reduced student numbers, the University should adopt more student-Centred and competence-based forms of assessment of learning
- **b)** More focus should be placed on continuous assessment, attendance and active student participation than on end of semester written examinations.
- **c)** More rigorous mechanisms should be put in place to ensure compulsory attendance of lectures and other learning activities for all Students. Students who do not attend 75% of the lectures should not be allowed to sit for the semester examinations.
- **d)** The quality of the examinations should be further strengthened. In Cuba for instance, Students’ examinations are designed according to the universities, but methodologically, the examinations must have the same national purposes. Examination processing is inspected by the National Accreditation Department (established to guarantee the quality of the curriculum, careers and institution) under the Ministry of Higher Education. The University Senate and NCHE should take keen interest in ensuring that University examinations meet the specifications stipulated in the National Qualifications Framework as well as the regional and relevant international qualifications.

### 5.5.5.2 Management of Academic Records at Makerere University

1. Set-up a fully-fledged archive for academic records at the University, with the ingredient security systems.
2. Fully automate/digitise students’ information management system. This could be done in a phased approach starting with the most recent records and moving backwards to the 1922 records. Students doing Archival Studies and Computer Studies could be engaged in this as a practical learning activity.
3. All records should be secured in the ‘Registry’ with a proper access control strategy.
4. Fire extinguishers should be installed in the ‘Registry’ and in other places where academic records are kept.
5. Government should consider waiving taxes on selected education goods and services in public higher education institutions, for instance tax levied on importing transcript blanks.
6. Roles of the key Departments in the management of Academic Affairs should be defined and clarified, especially between the AR and DVC AA.

### 5.5.6 University Facilities and Equipment

The University should in the short to medium term:

1. Ring-fence the annual Development Fee (currently UGX 123,500) paid by each student for repair, maintenance and expansion of teaching and learning infrastructure and purchase equipment.
(2) **Ensure safety and security of persons, property and infrastructure**: The Committee notes with concern the theft and vandalism of staff, students’ and institutional property and academic infrastructure as well as insecurity of all residents and guests of the University. It strongly recommends the following:

a) fencing the entire University,

b) installing CCTV cameras in key places,

c) digitizing identity cards to restrict access,

d) beefing up security checks at access gates,

e) strengthening the University Police Post to monitor security, and

f) accrediting Private Hostels for Students’ safe accommodation.

(3) **Infrastructure Inventory**: undertake a comprehensive study of the inventory to establish infrastructural and requisite material and supplies needs of each programme. Costs should be attached to improve current status of teaching and learning, research and innovation in the short, medium and long term.

(4) **Jinja Off-Shore Campus**: consider closing this Campus because it is ill-facilitated and ill-equipped to promote quality teaching & learning, research & innovations; and knowledge transfer partnerships & networking. It does not in its current status reflect an Off-Shore Campus of a 21st Century University

(5) **Laboratories**:

a) match enrolment with infrastructure, facilities, and academic staff as recommended by NCHE, 1:20 lecturer: student and 1:10 for ideal situation.

b) recruit new and retraining existing laboratory technicians in STEM Colleges.

c) set up tutorial and study rooms in each College, these should be considered in the Master Plan.

d) redesign existing teaching space to accommodate learner-centred methodologies for the five pilot academic units.

e) centralised secretarial and printing service and as a result most lecturers rely on services from the head of department.

(6) **The Library**:

a) raise the library budget to the acceptable level of 10% of University budgets (McGregor, 2007). This will enable the Library to invest in digital space at the Main Library and in the Colleges, and lessen the current stress on the existing physical space.

b) the annual library fee (currently UGX 20,000) paid by students should be ring-fenced to support library activities.

(7) **Distance Learning Programmes**: with the approval of the Distance Learning Policy, a number of Programmes should be rolled out in the Distance/Blended/e-learning mode. This will among others lessen the current stress on the existing physical space.

**Computers**:

a) increase the computer to student ratio to 1:2 for heavy Computer Courses of the nature offered at the COCIS.
b) like at the University of Cape Town, the University should consider a Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) Policy to cut costs in procuring and maintaining computers by the University. Indeed, a number of university students already have their own personal computers/laptops.

c) ring-fence the annual Technology Fee (currently UGX 50,000) paid by each Student to maintain and purchase teaching and learning equipment.

Government should:

(1) Explore giving incentives to the private sector to invest in facilities and equipment at the University.

(2) Centrally identify development partners to leverage research in critical STEM areas.
H.E. The President congratulating the Chief Executive Officer, Kiira Motors Corporation, Mr. Paul Isaac Musasizi on Launch of the Kayoola Solar Bus.
5.6 FINDINGS ON RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The Committee studied and examined the strategy for research and innovation at national and institutional level. At institutional level, the Committee picked keen interest in documenting some outstanding initiatives in research and innovation, sources of funding, research networks, collaborations and Centres of Excellence, research publications and intellectual property management. Moreover, the key challenges detrimental to the advancement of research and innovation at Makerere University were also appreciated. Below the Committee presented the key findings on these thematic areas.

5.6.1 National Research and Innovation Strategy

The Committee noted the absence of a National Research & Innovation Strategy and structural gaps amongst the various government agencies mandated to provide oversight for research and innovation for the realisation of the strategic objectives prescribed in Vision 2040 and in NDPII.

5.6.2 Research and Innovations at Makerere University

Research and Innovations is the second core function of Makerere University. The University has for the last decade purposed to become a learner-centred and research-led University (Strategic Plan 2007/08-2017/18). Research and innovations as a strategic pillar was premised on the University’s need to reposition herself in the national, regional and international environment where research and teaching/learning are mutually reinforcing. Two goals were identified namely: to consolidate and enhance the research profile of Makerere University; and to enhance transformation and utilisation of knowledge, research and innovations. Clearly, the University has a double-role; firstly as a site for training researchers/experts in different disciplinary fields, and secondly as a site for research.

(1) Makerere University as a Site for Training Researchers

Whereas research is conducted at undergraduate level in some fields of study, we focused mainly on postgraduate studies. As highlighted in Subsections and 5.4 of this Report, available evidence shows an increase in the number of specialised graduate programmes in Makerere University.

According to the Institutional Portfolio on Research, Innovation and Partnerships Report (Makerere University, July, 2017) submitted to the Visitation Committee, one of the indicators for the Research thrust of the University is the graduate enrolment. In the academic year 2016/17, the University had 587 PhD registered students (ref. to Table 5.6.2).

Table 5.6.2: Admitted and Registered PhD students (2016/17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design Art &amp; Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; External Studies</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Management Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing &amp; Information Sciences</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine Animal Resources &amp; Bio Security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerere University Business School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mak, Directorate of Research and Graduate Training, December 2016
The above statistics demonstrate the capacity of Makerere University to curve out her niche in providing postgraduate training and research for Uganda and beyond. There are numerous advantages accruing to postgraduate training and research including the increase in products from research and innovations, which have a potential for direct utilisation to solve societal challenges. For instance, the products from research and innovations spearheaded by the Ministry of Higher Education are higher income earners in Cuba.

In the current Makerere University graduate training model, all doctoral students are required to publish at least two journal articles or peer-reviewed book chapters before defending their doctoral dissertations/theses. However, since 1996 when the Government of Uganda re-channeled funds to basic education, postgraduate education has largely remained privately sponsored by individual students or donors such as SIDA. This partly explains why apart from CHS, some Colleges at Makerere University have not achieved the targeted of 20% increment in graduate enrolment during the planning period. Some Colleges are below 5% of the proportion of graduate students. The College of Health Sciences has registered an average of above 70 doctoral Students per year since 2010. Overall, registration for doctoral studies has stagnated implying that the University needs to find ways to improve on enrolment, retention and completion rates.

(2) Makerere University as a Site for Research

In this subsection, the Committee focused on Makerere University as a site for research. Makerere University sought to differentiate herself from other (public) universities as a leading institution in the advancement of basic and applied research in the humanities, science and technology to relevantly contribute to national development and the global economy. As a research-led University, it is committed to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, in a range of disciplines and fields. In December 2013, Senate approved the current Makerere University Research Agenda for the period 2013-2018 in the following six areas: Health and Health Systems; Agricultural (Crop & Livestock) transformation, Food Security and Livelihoods; Natural Resources Management and Climate Change; Education and Education Systems; Governance, Culture, Visual Arts, Social Justice, Communication and Sustainable development; and Science and Technology. Related cross-cutting issues focusing on S&T, which promote multidisciplinary research included; Knowledge Translation, Gender and Human Resource Development.

The University established Research and Satellite Centres to enable her engage in community-based research activities. These are:-

a) Makerere University Agricultural Research Institute Kabanyolo (MUARIK) – CAES
b) Budongo Forest Reserve and Research Centre - CAES
c) Buyana Stock Farm and Nakyesasa Farm - COVAB
d) Kasangati Health Centre - CHS
e) Demographic Surveillance Site Mayuge - Cross cutting
f) Extra-Mural Study Centres (with Learning Centres in Kabale, Hoima, Mbale, Lira and Kampala) - CEES

The University has two important policy instruments for regulating research and intellectual property; the Research and Innovations Policy (2008) and the Intellectual Property Management Policy. Recently, Makerere University’s Research Communication and Dissemination Strategy as an avenue for strengthening research uptake has been developed by the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training (DRGT) and ratified by Senate. The
DRGT is an institutional level structure responsible for the administration, coordination and monitoring of graduate training and research and innovation at institutional level. The Directorate has developed research management databases to monitor progress of staff and graduate students’ research work - RMACs, Staff Research Profiles Database, and Graduate Student Tracking System.

The Makerere University Research and Innovations Policy (2008) provides a strategic direction that the ultimate benefit of research does not only lie in the generation of new knowledge but also in the translation of knowledge into technologies, interventions and strategies effectively and appropriately delivered to those in need of such services. Makerere University through DRGT has intensified her effort in garnering continued and growing support for research, innovation and graduate training.

Besides GoU support to research and innovation through the Presidential Initiative on Science and Technology, Makerere University has been able to attract funding from a number of development partners including Carnegie Corporation, SIDA, Norway, USAID and EU, among others. As a result, there has been significant improvement in research output in various disciplines.

These interventions partly explain the high ranking of Makerere University in research and innovation during the period. For instance, the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking placed Makerere University in the 3rd position in 2015, 4th in 2016 and 3rd in 2017 in Africa, after the University of Cape Town and the University of Witwatersrand. However, the Elsevier Scopus Database places Uganda as the leading country in the 2016 Research Publications Partnerships.

5.6.2.1 Outstanding Initiatives in Research and Innovations

In her continued quest to become a research-led University, Makerere University has become an icon in research and innovation in Africa and globally, especially in the fields of medicine, agriculture, engineering, natural sciences, ICT and social sciences, which target national development needs. Among the outstanding initiatives include:

(1) Resilient Africa Network (RAN Lab)

Makerere University School of Public Health Resilient Africa Network (RAN) www.ranlab.org is founded on the premise of leveraging the talent and creativity within universities and communities to develop evidence based high-impact technologies and approaches to address development challenges. In particular, RAN has a specific focus to identify, develop and scale innovative solutions that strengthen the resilience of communities to natural and man-made stresses and shocks, and this requires deep engagement with vulnerable communities so as to understand and prioritize the development challenges. RAN has developed and tested a framework for building bottom-up resilience interventions through micro-resilience assessments in communities.
RAN began by conducting rapid ‘deep-dive’ micro-resilience assessments in target communities (clusters of sub-counties in selected districts affected by shared resilience issues). These assessments also allow innovators to identify and engage with key stakeholders and community at large. RAN has developed a set of tools to facilitate the translation of issues from the micro-resilience analyses into options for intervention and innovation which facilitates the sourcing of innovators with solutions that address the priority identified challenges. In the innovation process, identified innovators begin with a needs assessment where they interact with potential users within the community to ground assumptions their solutions are making about how to address the challenge. The continuous interaction with the community thereafter generates insights that regularly inform the design and refinement of the solution throughout the process (Design, pilot and scale). Following the back and forth between the innovators and community members to inform iteration of the solutions, the RAN team engages with these innovators for community piloting of their solutions to inform uptake.

RAN Lab [www.ranlab.org](http://www.ranlab.org) is a USAID-funded project in CHS (School of Public Health) designed to strengthen resilience in Africa through university-led local innovative solutions using evidenced-based approaches. The programme is operational in 18 Universities spread across 13 African Countries.
The lab manages a multidisciplinary portfolio of over 150 innovations, 75 of which have received SEED funding support to pilot, test and refine their solutions and the rest of the innovations have received technical and other support without funding including mentorship and capacity building. The Innovation Lab team has also been creative and developed EpiTent Limited (‘a portable habitation solutions’ provider) and the Dynamic Project Trajectory Toolkit-DPTT (used to track project trajectories). The lab has engaged over 1,372 academic staff from diverse disciplines and over 10,000 students through monthly events like innovation BootCamps, Innovation Garages, and capacity building trainings such as Human Centered Design (HCD), Hackathons, weekly innovation pitches, Business Modeling, Story Telling and Documentation, Grant writing, and Publication, and Internships, among others. The lab is well positioned to nurture budding entrepreneurs from universities, private sector and communities across Africa. It supports innovators to launch the most compelling ideas, start-up enterprises and businesses that tackle issues affected by communities such as climate change, food insecurity, rapid urbanization, disease epidemics, chronic conflict and displacement, among others.

RAN has developed the first ever and largest university institutionalized platform that can be used as a conduit for engagement with cities and communities in Africa in order to generate contextualized knowledge and skills to inform resilience-driven innovations.

RAN has also engaged in cutting edge research and translating these research findings into sustainable start-ups. Through this process, RAN has tested and used these connections to the communities to generate contextualized knowledge and data to inform resilience-driven innovations. Through this platform, RAN has developed tools such as the Resilience Analytical Framework, common Lexicon of resilience dimensions and the RAN analytical approach. In addition, RAN has undertaken resilience analyses covering 26 communities in Africa, generating 6 resilience problem sets and 15 scientifically proven resilience innovation pathways. RAN has built a working collaboration with national and local governments in countries where the universities are located. In these countries resilience data has been collected, policy and program stakeholders engaged using a resilience lens that promotes interdisciplinary and integrated sectoral programs. The results accumulated over the years have contributed to positioning the lab as a reliable partner and utilitarian platform for catalyzing innovation in the region and beyond.

More specifically, RAN offers a list of opportunities to: build the capacities of both upcoming and existing innovators, entrepreneurs and the community at large, inform policy, and generate evidence based resilience data.
The Iconic innovation at RAN Lab is the Epi-Tent for Frontline health workers involved in humanitarian interventions in humid hot climates who work under very stressful conditions characterized by extreme heat (See Figure 5.6.2.1(c) and (d) above). A team of staff, students and private experts led by the Resilient Africa Network (RAN) at Makerere University School of Public Health have designed the next generation tent to support emergency humanitarian service delivery. The new design reduces the average ambient air within the tent cavity by an average of 5.40°C during day-light time. More importantly, the optimized design reduces the average ambient temperature by between 6-70°C during the critical hottest 8 hours of the day (9am to 5pm). The tent reduces the maximum temperature reachable in the tent cavity by 9-120°C (From a TMAX attained by the existing standard tent of 52.50°C). The tent substantially reduces social exclusion by allowing occupants free perception of the outside environment, yet maintaining privacy. An assortment of 12 ergonomic accessories have been carefully identified, developed and embedded into an advanced prototype of the design to transform the tent into a portable office/health center.

The 2016 RAN Lab achievements include:-

Firstly, working with multidisciplinary students, faculty and the communities, the RAN team translated knowledge generated in the classrooms into innovations. The innovations portfolio expanded to over 150 potentially transformative innovative solutions in the fields of agriculture, health, engineering, financial inclusion and governance that address community needs. Some of these innovations include:

a) **The Low-Cost Solar Irrigation Pump** used by small holder farmers to supply water to their gardens thus improving harvest. The solar-powered portable irrigation pump was embraced by the Government of Uganda as a solution for providing cheap means of water for farmers and is currently on the market. The system is able to source water within 100 metres and 8-10meters above the ground and can pump 450 litres of water per hour for 8 hours daily. The Irrigation Pump is currently being used in Mukono and Pallisa districts, Uganda. This prototype joins the earlier pump developed under the Presidential Initiative for Science and Technology.

b) **Pedal Tap**, a Non-Touch Water Dispensing System currently being used in several of the Kampala City Council Authority public washrooms and Mulago National Referral Hospital, Uganda.

c) **The Maize thresher**, a low-cost optimized post-harvest technology for mechanized threshing and winnowing of maize. It has eased labour costs among farmer groups in Nakasongola, Kasese and Hoima districts.

d) **The Solar Dryer**, an efficient, express dryer that uses solar technology to facilitate faster drying of a broad range of agricultural produce retaining the food aroma, colour and nutrients. This technology has been used in Matugga a suburb in Luwero district and currently being used in parts of Kampala Uganda.
e) *Community Radio in a bucket*, a technology that uses a transmitter and telephony to replace a conventional radio studio for broadcasting. This is currently serving in Northern Uganda (Oyam, Kitgum and Agago districts).

![Figure 5.6.2.1 (e) Community Radio in a Bucket](image)

f) *Improved Push and Pull Technology*, an innovative approach to inter-cropping that dually suppresses nuisance weeds and pests. This has been tested in Eastern Uganda areas of Iganga district.

g) *Village Egg Bank*, a model that encourages savings among small holder farmers. This concept thus becomes the ‘currency’ in the community. This ‘bank currently operates in Yumbe district, West Nile region of Uganda.

h) *Matibabu*: A non-invasive technology for Malaria diagnosis The team is headed by Brian Gitta, gittabrian@gmail.com,

![Matibabu](image)

Matibabu is a pocket-sized hardware device that uses a beam of red-light to detect malaria parasites in blood tissues. The technology is simple to use, non-invasive, low cost and does not require blood drawing devices making it viable in primary care settings in hard-to-reach areas where the microscope is not accessible. The innovators are currently preparing to start off with clinical tests with their iterated prototype (Matiscope).

The Lab has over 120 multi-sectoral key stakeholders engaged for innovation including development partners in the private sector, government and NGOS. Some of the stakeholders engaged include; Rockefeller Foundation, UNDP, UN Women, UNFPA, UNHCR, NUCAFÉ, Parliament of Uganda, Agha Khan Foundation, Humanitarian Leadership Academy, IGAD, Save the Children and Uganda Communications Commission.

RAN has cultivated an Innovation Culture through engagements with students, faculty and the community to creatively think in order to respond to community needs. Some of the activities which aid this include;
a) Trainings in the Human Centred Design processes to promote innovating for, with and by the end users,
b) Community co-creation sessions engaging community members to think differently and
c) Engaging the girl child in the innovation process through initiatives like the annual Technovation Challenge and RAN4Gals among others. Innovation is now a buzz word for many.
d) Business development support to all innovators.

Other outstanding College-based active research and innovations projects in Health Sciences, Agricultural and Agricultural Engineering Research, Animal Production Technology, Agro-processing and Value Addition, Crop Production Technology, some of which have been patented include the following:

(2) **The New Lateral Flow Test Research Project**, jointly undertaken by the Department of Biochemistry and Sports Science (CONAS) in collaboration with a Ugandan Manufacturer Astel Diagnostics Ltd, and six other implementing agencies from Congo, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Malawi, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania. The new test accurately detects parasites in tsetse flies that cause sleeping sickness. The project was funded through a five-year research grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

(3) **Strengthening Regional Capacity in Research and Training in Fisheries and Aquaculture for Improved Food Security and Livelihoods in Eastern Africa (STRECAFISH) Project (2015-2018)**, implemented by Department of Zoology, Entomology and Fisheries Sciences (CONAS) funded under the Austrian Partnership Programme in Higher Education and Research for Development (APPEAR).

(4) **EnPe Project (2016 – 2020)** a collaboration between Department of Geology and Petroleum Studies (CONAS), University of Juba in South Sudan and University of Bergen in Norway, renewed funding by Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) totaling NOK 8.5 million (approximately USD 800,000).

(5) **Capacity Building in Environmental Management for the Oil Sector**, commenced in October 2013. The U.S. Agency for International Development office in Uganda awarded a $6 million contract to TetraTech ARD and Texas A&M University in U.S.A to support strengthening of capacity of Ugandan professionals in the public and private sector to manage the environmental impacts of the oil and gas sector. Makerere University through CONAS serves as the lead institution for a strategic planning process and development of framework for educational capacity building activities.

(6) **Centre for Technology Design and Development**, is CEDAT’s Student Incubation Centre coordinating technology development and transfer activities in the College, and supporting and nurturing final year students’ innovations into profitable and fruitful business enterprises. Among the prototypes tested and deployed to help the rural communities include solar fruit driers, maize shredders, peddle washing and wind turbine.

(7) **Hopitrack**, a solution to help securely, safely and effectively track patients, medical personnel, and medical equipment (CHS under the Walter Reed Project).

(8) **Vaccine trial (RV 403)** will use vaccines that were tested in the RV 144 efficacy study, the only HIV vaccine trial to show an efficiency of 31.2% (CHS under the Walter Reed Project).
(9) **Ebola research at Walter Reed Project** (2015)

(10) **Mak Lung Institute – MULI- (CHS):** established under the auspices of the Lung Consortium International to stimulate high quality lung health research, training and clinical care programmes within the University to improve lung health of Ugandans and beyond.

(11) **The Infectious Disease Institute (IDI)** in collaboration with the University of Nebraska concluded its research on Specific Antiretroviral Therapy Drug-Drug Interaction and its impact on reproductive health.

(12) **Population-based Tuberculosis Survey** (CEASand SPH): commissioned the first ever TB National Survey supported by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and WHO. The survey was designed to improve the accuracy of data regarding planning for TB control and prevention.

(13) **Recycling diesel from plastics Project** CAES: in partnership with University of Kentucky, USA. The innovation is an attempt to utilise waste polythene bags/plastics to address the problem of hazards caused by poor disposal of polythene bags.

(14) **Manufacture of organic pesticide from agricultural waste:** CAES (MUARIK) in partnership with University of Kentucky, USA. The pesticide is for use by farmers to control pests and presents business opportunities for organic farming and export.

(15) **Groundnut Juice** (CAES- FTBIC): Food Science and Technology Student, James Matindo made the Groundnut Juice code-named *Lifetime Juice* that could be the first of its kind in the world. The juice is a nutritious product containing sodium, calcium, iron and vitamin C, and emerged the best innovation at the College 2014 exhibition themed “Youth Innovation: A key to Agricultural Development and Environmental Sustainability in Uganda”.

(16) **Tomato Processing Plant** (CAES- FTBIC): Opened in Nakaseke basing on technical expertise and design from the FTBIC and Mobile fruit processor. H. E. President Museveni launched a UGX 700 million tomato processing plant in Kapeka, Nakaseke District dubbed Bulumezi 2014 Ltd.

(17) **High yielding, Drought and Disease-tolerant Sweet potato varieties** (CAES- Department of Agricultural Production): Over 20 sweet potato elite varieties developed at Makerere University’s Research Institute Kabanyolo named *Kabanyolo Sweet Potatoes* (KSP) were supplied to a group of 30 farmers in Hoima District to select the high yielding variety. The three-year project was funded under the Regional Collaborative Programmes of the Swedish International Development Aid (SIDA) Makerere University, Namulonge Agricultural Research Station, KAZARDI in Kabale, Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), Mikocheni Agricultural Institute (Tanzania), University of Addis-Ababa (Ethiopia) and Rwanda Agricultural Research Board.

(18) **MAAIF & DAP Livestock Breeding Guidelines:** The Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in conjunction with CAES (Department of Agricultural Production) developed livestock breeding guidelines (2014) to advise farmers on how to produce meat of a higher quality and more meat from fewer animals using the locally available resources. The eight-year project, sponsored by DANIDA, was in partnership with Copenhagen and Akhus Universities in Denmark, Sokoine University Tanzania. Five PhD students and twenty Masters have been trained; two of
the PhD students were from Tanzania and three from Uganda while ten MSc were both from Uganda and Tanzania.

(19) **AFRISA Platform (COVAB)**

Africa Institute for Strategic Animal Resource Services and Development (AFRISA) is a Not-For Profit semi-autonomous Agency of Makerere University, supported by the GoU through the MoES to address a gap in job creation in the animal resource sector. The programmes focus on Commodity Value chains in Dairy, Meat, leather, Poultry, Pig, Bees and Fish. The AFRISA platform operates as an Academic-Community-Public-Private Partnership where the University works with the private and public sectors to train and deliver services, aimed at producing transformed, committed and productive entrepreneurs through skills, science, technology, innovations and community services. Some of the activities are highlighted below:-

a) **Capacity Building**: skills for production and development especially in animal resource value chains. In 2016, training of artisans was commissioned and a total of about 550 Artisans have trained in goat rearing, poultry, piggery and Apiary. The results have been (i) students in dairy technology developed a low-cost yoghurt production to cater for millions of school-going children; (ii) Students in Pig technology developed a technology from Indigenous Micro-Organisms (IMO) which is used to promote odourless pig-farming. The IMO technology is available in form of a paste; iii) Students in leather technology developed affordable durable and quality shoes from pure leather from local hides and skins.

Other capacity building trainings included training in Hydroponic Fodder Production Technology, training communities in Indigenous Micro-organisms Technology, Sensitisation Seminar for Abattoir Workers, and training in East Coast Fever in partnership with the Government of Uganda.

b) **SPEDA** carried out training of Students (600) with assistance from UPDF in Atiak, Northern Uganda. The training was in goat rearing, poultry, piggery and Apiary. The exercise was partially supported by the Office of the First Lady and the UPDF who provided the necessary security and sensitisation of the population.

The SPEDA model is now operating industrial cottage enterprises, which have taken off at Nakyesasa Incubation Centre. The Centre is being upgraded into an Industrial Enterprise and Skilling Centre. The dairy, piggery, apiary and fish enterprises have been initiated as enterprises for skilling for scale agro processing. The project embarked on planting a variety of pastures/legumes (Napier/Elephant grass, Brachiaria, Panicum, Chloris, Lablab) used to feed the animals in the dairy value chain.

c) **The Research Centre for Ticks and Tick-borne Disease Control (RTC)** was established with support from the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The Centre is aimed at broadening the research in ticks and to address the outbreaks of animal diseases specifically the tick-borne diseases that are a common occurrence.

d) **National Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance**: Uganda was selected by the World Health Organisation (WHO) Advisory Group on Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance (AGISAR) to implement the two-year project entitled “Movement pathways of antimicrobial agents and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in humans, food-producing animals and retail foods in Uganda”.
e) **Mak-BTI affiliation set to transform Bunyoro-Kitara:** COVAB through the Africa Institute for Strategic Animal Resource Services and Development (AFRISA) partnered with the Bunyoro Transformation Initiative (BTI) to enhance the livelihoods of the people of Bunyoro with skills in production, enterprise development and academic growth in Bunyoro sub-region. These efforts are aimed at poverty reduction and enrichment of the peoples’ knowledge in livestock management and production.

(20) **ICT Research:** COCIS set new trends with regard to ICT education, research and innovations in Africa to help solve the ongoing national and global challenges such as climate change, food security, health, education and national transformation. Mainly supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations, Google and USAID under the Resilient Africa Network, COCIS has developed ICT applications targeting agriculture, health and other day-to-day engagements, among these include:

a) **the AgShare:** has provided indigenous knowledge preservation in the areas of cattle keeping, banana, beans, cassava and maize growing and poultry. The research findings are uploaded on the online OER database.

b) **Traffic Monitoring App:** a group of Mak PhD researchers at COCIS invented a traffic congestion monitoring app for developing cities, which is cheaper compared to the prevailing technology and can help users predict their traffic time.

c) **Kudu-mobile:** in collaboration with UC Berkeley and UC San Diego has come up with Kudu – a mobile auctions system (http://kudu.ug) for buying and selling agricultural produce in Uganda. The traders send a single text message and the system takes into account price, location and other factors to find the best matches.

d) **Whitefly App:** developed under the Programme for Emerging Agricultural Research Leaders (PEARL) with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation innovated an automated mobile survey technology and spatial modelling of viral cassava diseases in Uganda. The app was tested by researchers at the National Crops Resources Research Institute (NaCRRI) and is set to boost cassava production. This work is part of the a broader programme supporting work in the Artificial Intelligence and Data Science Research Group of the School of CIT.

e) **Telecoms Data:** COCIS in collaboration with United Nations Global Pulse developed an App to predict Infectious Disease spread in Uganda. The project involves analysis of statistics collected from telecom companies in Uganda to monitor the movement of the population in order to predict the spread of threatening infectious diseases.

f) **Mobile Laboratory Diagnostics:** developed by COCIS students through the Grand Challenges Grant in collaboration with clinicians in Mulago National Referral Hospital. The App uses 3D-printed Microscope Adapters on which phones with cameras can be mounted on a microscope eyepiece. The software then carries out image processing in order to count parasites and pathogens. Work has focused on malaria diagnosis and is expanding into identification of tuberculosis bacilli and intestinal parasites.

g) **E-Musawo Apps:** an emergency Telemedicine mobile appliance used in examining patients’ pressure was exhibited along with Musawo Drugs, a mobile
app that helps to authenticate drugs, show drugs’ details, identify the cheapest drugs and the nearest hospital from which people can access those drugs. These Apps were developed by young innovators from COCIS and the School of Public Health.

h) **MDex**: a windows phone app that uses attached external objective lens and computer vision to diagnose sickle cell.

i) **ASKARI**: a mobile security application that acknowledges the power of communication using powerful features to help keep a person safe.

j) **Ocula**: an automated mobile microscopic diagnosis; a platform for carrying out microscopic tests automatically, on smart phone or note book.

k) **E-Liiso - Sight for everyone**: a smart phone mobile application aimed at cheaply diagnosing trachoma of human eyes by people in rural and urban areas.

l) **Tech4farmers**: a digital agricultural commodity exchange to help farmers sell produce directly to consumers or traders, negotiate for better prices while minimising the need for middlemen and facilitating access to genuine agricultural input.

m) Other innovations include a **Blind Mobile user app**, **RootIO -a community radio**, which uses a mobile phone to broadcast-low Cost Solar Pump and Gasifier Stoves for purifying water.

(21) **Promoting food security and livelihoods of low-income women in central Uganda Project**, a collaboration among the Department of Adult and Community Education (CEES), Global Nutrition and Health Programme- Metropolitan University College (Lead Partner) and a Uganda-based NGO - **Community Health and Information Network (CHAIN)**.

(22) **Mobile Information Communication Technology**, by the Department of Open and Distance Learning (CEES), a mobile broadcast system which provides one way asynchronous communication to Students.

(23) **Tuning Africa Project**, the East African School of Higher Education Studies and Development (CEES) is a member of the **Tuning Project Phase II (2015-2018)** in the subject group on "Higher Education Management" funded by the African Union Commission and European Union Commission.

(24) **Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Higher Education Leadership and Management in sub-Saharan Africa** is an institutional capacity building project funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Finland. It is aimed at creating sustainable knowledge bases and in form of masters and doctoral programmes in higher education leadership and management. Partners are the East African School for Higher Education Studies and Development (CEES), Uganda Management Institute, University of KwaZulu-Natal, University of Helsinki and University of Tampere (UTA).

(25) **The North-South-South partnership (N-S-S) programme for staff exchange, masters and doctoral student mobility and intensive course**. Partners are the East African School for Higher Education Studies and Development (CEES), University of Tampere in Finland, Uganda Management Institute and, and the University of KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa. The focus is on Studies in Higher Education Leadership and Management.
(26) **Distance and Education Leapfrogging Project (2013-2018)**, a collaborative project between the University of Agder in Norway and the University of Makerere, with support from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation to the tune of 18 million NOK. The Project aims to increase access to flexible quality education in Uganda.

(27) **Policy & Social Research**: Policy research in 2016 centred on development of dialogue with key national and international stakeholders in the areas of economy, higher education, and reproductive health. These were organised by various University units, including, the COBAMS, CHUSS, MISR. Among these included the following:-

a) High-level policy dialogue on Uganda’s economy under a Theme: “Directions, Prospects, and Challenges” (School of Economics, COBAMS) in collaboration with the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development and United Nations Development Programme.

b) Public Policy Forum on Higher Education (MISR) which attracted participants from Research Institutions, Development Agencies and Embassies in Kampala.

c) Launch of the first-ever Uganda History, Archaeology and Heritage Association to promote the disciplines of History and Archaeology through intensive research and quality publications and support the current regime of Historians to “fit in the shoes of eminent scholars”.

d) Launch of UN “Progress of the World’s Women 2015-2016: Transforming Economies, Realising Rights” Report (School of Women and Gender Studies, CHUSS); a flagship report highlighting the progress of women globally.

Through engagement in research and innovation, the University has been able to forge several research networks and collaborations, as well as acquire several Centres of Excellence at the national and regional levels. Some of the Centres of Excellence are internationally accredited Two outstanding innovations have been commercialised.

### 5.6.2.2 Commercialisation of Research and Innovations

The Committee recognised the commendable effort by the University working with Government (Presidential Initiative for STI) to commercialise some of the outstanding innovations from Makerere University: The Kiira EV Project has been taken up and Kiira Motors Corporation established to go into commercial assembly of Vehicles in Uganda; and the Presidential Initiative on Banana Industrial Development (PIBID) in Bushenyi aimed at supporting the banana sector turn the banana into a more valued food-by processing it into other products.

### 5.6.2.3 Research Networks, Collaborations and Centres of Excellence

There have been significant achievements registered by the University in expanding her research networks, collaborations and Centres of Excellence.

#### A: Notable Research Networks

(1) **SIDA-supported Research Partnerships and Collaborations**: Under the SIDA programme the DRGT developed joint/collaborative research projects between Makerere University and several Swedish Universities. One of these included initiations of the 1st joint degree program between Makerere University and Karolinska Institute.
The Visitation Committee Members Visiting the Pilot Agro-Processing Plant of PIBD
(2) The Cambridge Africa Partnership for Research Excellence (CAPREx) Project 2012 – 2015: The collaboration focused on Postdoc research fellowships including Makerere University, University of Ghana – Legon, and University of Cambridge, UK. The Project aimed to develop African academic research, research management and internationalisation. The Carnegie Corporation of New York awarded CAPREx a successor grant to the tune of USD 1,000,000 to support 24 Academic Fellows from Makerere and the University of Ghana in the period 2015 to 2018.

(3) The Norwegian Programme for Capacity Development in Higher Education and Research for Development (NORHED): This broad-based network of institutions covering different disciplines ranging from ICT, health and agriculture bringing together African, Norwegian and Asian Universities.

(4) The Development Impact Lab Project: The University of California at Berkeley together with CHUSS signed a Consortium grant contract worth USD20 million. The Development Impact Lab project focuses on impact evaluation studies in health, social sciences and information technology. It offers competitive scholarships and research grants to staff in the partner universities. The focus is to utilise mobile technologies to improve health care; expand communications services in remote areas; improve access to safe water; and deliver new energy technologies.

(5) The Afri Child Centre: officially launched in CHUSS in October 2014 to improve child protection practice and inform policy through research, analysis and knowledge development. The Centre is a product of academia, government, civil society and international development agencies i.e. Uganda Programme Learning Group of the Child Protection in Crisis (CPC) Network promoted by six partners namely: Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; UNICEF-Uganda; ChildFund International Uganda Office; CHUSS; TPO Uganda; and Columbia University.

(6) The Makerere-Bergen Collaboration that embraces the College of Natural Sciences and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences as well as the Israel-Uganda apprenticeship scheme.

B: Notable Centres of Excellence

(1) African Centres of Excellence (ACE) funded by the World Bank as platforms to develop capacity of University staff, government officials and the private sector. The Performance-based Centres will train up to 50 PhDs and 150 Masters Students in addition to infrastructure development and research projects. The two World Bank-funded ACE are:

a) The Makerere University Regional Centre of Excellence for Crop Improvement (MaRCCI): a World Bank supported Centre inaugurated in October 2015 in CAES. The objective of the Centre is to meet the demand for skills required for Africa's development in areas such as agriculture, energy, extractive industries, etc., while strengthening the innovation capacity of the best African higher education institutions in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), and other relevant disciplines.

Centre of Materials, Product Development & Nanotechnology (MAPRONANO) (CEDAT). The Centre will develop two Master’s programs, i.e. Master of Science in Nanotechnology and Master of Science in Materials and Product Development. Each of these Masters programs is expected to train over 68 students over a period of 4 years. The intensive training is intended to urgently fill the gap required in
promoting value addition of primary produce in the Great Lakes region. The over 60 trained graduate students will produce Nano-related solutions to problems of energy, water and environments affecting the Great Lakes region. Nano-technology innovations will focus on state of the art research on energy, water and the environment.

Materials and Product Development focuses on value addition of raw materials for the explicit purpose of enabling industries in the Great Lakes region develop products that are of high quality and of internationally accepted standards. This research theme is expected to train 4 PhD students.

(2) **The Makerere University Climate Change Research and Innovations (MUCCRI) Centre**: was opened in CAES in 2013 to promote awareness on climate change, conduct research on climate change science, climate change mitigation and adaptation in all sectors and disseminate the generated information. The Centre also generates and disseminates innovations for climate change mitigation and adaptation in agricultural sciences and natural resources sectors. Through research and dissemination of findings, the Centre also advocates and influences climate change and development policy to enable Uganda address climate change challenges.

(3) **The Plant Breeding, Biotechnology and Seed systems Research Centre** (CAES): was identified to serve as a focal node for training in the above areas for the region. The Centre in partnership with a private biotechnology company (Agro-technologies Uganda Limited) is developing and distributing disease-free tissue culture banana. The Centre is also participating in producing cassava materials for East and Central Africa supporting ASARECA and the Catholic Relief Services.

(4) **The Centre for Soybean Improvement and Development** (CAES): established in 2016 to look at different innovations in soybean. This includes development of new varieties, production and maintenance of foundation seed from different varieties and value addition. A seed system is being developed for up-scaling of new technologies and to facilitate quick adoption of the new varieties within Uganda and in the region.

(5) **East African Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (EACREEE)** launched in June 2016 by the Minister of Energy and Mineral Development under a partnership between CEDAT, East African Community and the Austrian Development Agency. The Centre is part of the Global Network of Regional Sustainable Energy Centres that currently include: the ECOWAS Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (ECREEE) in Cape Verde; the Caribbean Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (CCREEE) in Barbados; the Pacific Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (PCREEE) and the SADC Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (SACREEE). The Centre is to contribute towards increased access to modern, affordable and reliable energy services, energy security and mitigation of negative externalities of the energy system (e.g. local pollution and Green House Gas emissions) by creating an enabling environment for renewable energy and energy efficiency markets and investments.

(6) **East African Oncology Centre of Excellence** under the Uganda Cancer Institute was launched in 2016. Within this framework, the Department of Paediatrics together with the Uganda Cancer Institute, Baylor-Uganda, and Baylor College of Medicine at Houston Texas, USA launched the first-ever East African Haematology Oncology Fellowship with support from the African Development Bank to train specialised
paediatricians and related health staff in paediatric haematology and oncology. Four members of staff were awarded the fellowship scholarships for the two years.

5.6.2.4 Research Publications at Makerere University

A key source of research funds for Makerere University is Grants. In addition to being a source of income, grants do measure the rate at which research outputs generated by the University are being utilised to solve problems in society. In addition, grants support further research and capacity building at the University.

As part of the research support system, Council approved the Research and Innovations Communication Strategy (RICS). The goal of RICS is to institutionalise a coherent approach to communicate the University’s research and innovation outputs to increase their relevance and uptake by various end-users (Unpublished Makerere University Report on Institutional Portfolio on Research, Innovation and Partnerships, 2017). Table 5.6.2 show the College level publications between 2010 and 2016.

Table 5.6.2: Makerere Academic Staff Publications by College, 2010-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Staff Study by Visitation Committee, 2016

From the above illustrations, it is evident that CHS contributes almost 50% of the entire research portfolio of the University and over 50% in terms of active grants. Generally, the science-based Colleges dominate the research space and are therefore commended for improving the ranking of the University in the region and on the continent. Indeed, the Elsevier Scopus Database for 2015-2016 showed that most of the publications are from the fields of Medicine, Agricultural and Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology, Social Sciences, Immunology and Microbiology and Environmental Science. This implies that the Business, Arts and Humanities Colleges are teaching-heavy, while the Science-based Colleges have an inclination towards research and innovation.

5.6.2.5 Research Dissemination

According to the Makerere University Report on Institutional Research Portfolio (2017) submitted to the Visitation Committee, research dissemination and output remains the core area that contributes to the University’s productivity. This has been done through conferences, lecture series seminar series, workshops, dialogues and exhibitions. Research dissemination has supported the University remain afloat in the national public domain to influence policy.
The research publications have given the University an academic competitive edge that continues to place her among the best universities in Africa. The year (2016) under review has had an increase in dissemination activities.

5.6.3 Attraction of Funding for Research and Innovation

There are three sources of research funding: Government of Uganda, Internally Generated Funds (IGFs) and Development Partners. The Committee observed that each student annually contributes UGX 20,000 towards the research fund, however, less than one per cent (1%) of the IGFs have been allocated to research and innovations. The Committee learnt that most of the IGFs for teaching, research & innovations, and KTPs and networks have been re-located to paying staff incentive allowances. Therefore, under this subsection, the Committee highlights some of the ongoing research and innovation activities supported by Government and Development Partners.

1. Research Projects funded under the Presidential Initiative on Science & Technology

Based on the Makerere University Institutional Portfolio on Research, Innovation and Partnerships Report (2017) submitted to the Committee, the Presidential Initiative on S&T at Makerere University commenced in 2010. The first phase of funding concluded in the year under review with remarkable contribution. The Initiative has since then boosted the platform for the University to contribute to national development through knowledge generation, innovations and transfer by integrating the community, the academia and research. Some of the key achievements include innovations in food technology and agro processing; engineering and transportation technologies; community-based value addition and networking. The Initiative has extended to skills enhancement for youth in areas of animal production technology. The Initiative supports three Colleges, i.e. the CAES - specifically the School of Food Technology, Nutrition and Bio-engineering, CEDAT and COVAB. Below is a highlight of some of the initiatives integrating research & innovations and knowledge transfer partnerships & networking:-

a) The Food Technology & Business Incubation Centre (FTBIC) under the School of Food Technology, Nutrition and Bio-engineering (CAES) is the first University-based technology and business incubator in the East and Central African Region. The Centre was commissioned by H.E. President Y.K. Museveni in 2009. It has seven years of enterprise development and creation of opportunities in the food industry.

The following achievements have been registered by the Centre:

(1) Research in agro-processing and capacity building to accommodate more production processing and business incubation. More than 1300 Students, Staff and interested members from the general Public have been trained in entrepreneurship. Business enterprises have flourished and Staff and Student capacity for developing commercial products enhanced. Among the specific key achievements include the following:

Partnerships developed to expand agro processing capacity include:-

• Collaboration with Imuka Ventures to develop a Business Development Service (BDS) model to support FTBIC Incubatees. The partnership is supported by Bocconi University of Italy. The project is carrying out random controlled trials in which a large population of aspiring entrepreneurs in Uganda will interact in order to improve their business ideas.
• Collaboration with the Fisheries Department at the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries sponsored a Post-Harvest Handling of fish seminar for all stakeholders as part of the fish value chain community development in the Lango sub-region. This was aimed at sensitising the stakeholders on the economic importance and development of the Fish Industry in the sub-region.

**Capacity building:** fifteen (15) enterprises were nurtured and graduated from the Incubator to set up their own businesses. Over 20 brands were registered and more than 30 different products developed. The Centre has created 100 direct jobs in production and marketing of value-added foods and additional jobs for over 500 raw material suppliers.

**Short Skills Training and Mentoring Programme for SMEs:** More than 600 (youths, women, entrepreneurs, budding entrepreneurs, farmers, traders, exporters, supermarket staff, inspectors and extension workers) were given demand-driven short skills and SME entrepreneurship training for dairy products, bakery products, fruit juices and jams, sauces, etc. and many started microenterprises in food processing. This Centre further engaged a number of virtual incubatees under its Virtual Incubation Programme (VIP) to provide emerging entrepreneurs with on-site and off-site services as they matured in their businesses. Figure 5.6.3a displays a section of the Business Product Development Section at FTBIC.

![Figure 5.6.3a: The Business Product Development Section at FTBIC, Source: Makerere University Report, 2017](image)

The Center also nurtures and sustains food and allied businesses especially among women and young graduates by providing innovative research, practical solutions, linkages, entrepreneurship development, and outreach leading to wealth creation and nutrition enhancement.

**Increase in processing space, installation of processing equipment and equipping of laboratories:**

**Expansion:** The Centre is in advanced stages of the Construction of the FTBIC 1200 m² building extension. This first phase of the construction will provide 2 separate process areas measuring and office space for incubatees and incubator staff. Procurement of equipment to enhance the processing units to a level that most food processing operations can be carried out. At the time of the visit by the Committee,
the meat processing, dairy processing, mobile fruit and vegetable processing, extrusion processing, confectionary and baking processing lines were fully functional and equipped with state-of-the-art technology. The thermal processing and fermentations will come on board as more space is available as illustrated in Figure 5.6.3b below.

![Figure 5.6.3b: Extension of the FTBIC, Source: Makerere University Report, 2017](image)

**Equipment**: the Centre acquired state-of-the-art equipment including the Mobile Fruit and Vegetable Processor which was deployed in Yumbe District to process mangoes in 2013 and 2014 and consequently, a mango processing plant is planned for Yumbe District. In 2013, the same plant was deployed to pilot process tomatoes in Nakaseke District and consequently, a Rural Industrial Centre is being established in Kapeeka. In addition, Pineapple Pulp and Citrus Juice Extractors are being hired by SMEs to process their products. The Centre has also acquired an Extruder.

**Department of Agricultural & Bio-systems Engineering: MV MULIMI Project** invented a three-wheeled Farmers Multipurpose tractor code-named the “MV Mulimi” a multi-purpose low cost mechanised solution using locally available materials, including re-cycling from old cars. The tractor consumes less than a half litre of diesel fuel per day. MV Mulimi purposed for small scale farmers has been tested for and is capable of performing five (5) tasks, namely; threshing maize to reduce post- harvest losses; pumping water for irrigation; charging phones to keep farmers informed of agricultural produce markets; hauling agricultural produce up to 1 ton and ploughing fields and transporting up to 1.5 tonnes of agricultural produce from the farm to home or market. The Mulimi Project was spearheaded by Professor Noble Banadda the Next Einstein Fellowship (NEF) 2015.

**b) College of Engendering Design Art and Technology**

The following are the College achievements under the Presidential Initiative on S&T:

i. **Improvement of engineering research facilities**: especially rehabilitation and modernisation of laboratories, including materials, thermodynamics, fluids, water resources, telecommunications, power, electronics, soil mechanics, environmental laboratories, and public health lab, among others. The fully equipped laboratories have placed CEDAT as a regional hub for engineering research. The College has further created a national resource to facilitate engineering research for the public and private sectors in Uganda.

ii. **The Centre for Research in Transportation Technologies [CRTT]** produced:
The famous Kiira EV and the Kayoola Solar Bus

b. has embarked on research for the drone transportation technologies.

iii. The Centre for Technology Design and Development (CTDD) is at the forefront of facilitating technology development and transfer activities. The Centre is committed towards commercialisation of two projects, i.e. the solar food drier and the collapsible bodaboda helmet. The design improvements for both were done

iv. Innovation Systems and Clusters Programme; Enhancing Innovation and competitiveness in business among SMEs, 75 cluster initiatives have been launched country-wide, representing different sectors of Uganda’s economy.

v. The ARMS Project has created a blend of relevant pedagogical experiences and industry-grade information system solutions.

vi. The Centre for Research in Energy and Energy Conservation (CREEC) has enhanced access to modern types of energy through applied research, training and consultancy within Uganda and the East African region. CREEC is working with the Ministry of Energy (the Rural Electrification Project) to extend the usage of solar to rural communities and reduce the usage of candles and fuel lamps. The Centre has setup solar kiosks and a 1.62kW solar mini-grid to provide clean, cheap and efficient lighting solutions for the rural population in 4 districts which communities hire at less than UGX. 500, the equivalent of their daily expenditure on kerosene. This has reduced the number of people using fuels lamps, accidents due to fires. The solar mini-grid also provides affordable lighting solution for businesses, thereby increasing working hours and the livelihood of the people, especially the youth.

vii. Low Cost Irrigation Schemes Project: The Project has continued improving the design of the pumps and testing proto-types of solar water pumps to promote adoption of irrigation technologies by smallholder farmers to irrigate crops and guarantee all year production, and hence improve food security of the country. The Project established a Demonstration Irrigation System at Makerere University Agricultural Research Institute, Kabanyolo with three facets of Institutional water supply, Irrigation and Water for animals under the zero-grazing scheme. The irrigation of coffee farms using the Makerere solar water pumps is under way and UCDA has agreed in principle to fund some trial irrigation sites on coffee farms before full scale roll out. The Project will soon be supplying water to farming communities to mitigate the effects of drought. Farmers in Zirobwe, Kayunga, Wakiso, Mityana, Buyende, Nyabushozi, and tea growers in Kyenjojo requested for demonstrations and are already benefitting from the pumps. The feasibility study for manufacture of solar water pumps developed by the Project was also presented to Parliament for funding.

viii. CEDAT’s iLabs@Mak Project: The iLabs@Mak Project has for the 5th year running pioneered the College out-reach and knowledge transfer initiative. The team has over the years encouraged innovations in S&T among secondary school students. This has been done through various robotics trainings and through organising the country’s only Science and Technology Innovations Challenge. This is held annually and this year-round, it grew in numbers to have 12 schools participate up from 8 last year.

ix. Innovation Systems and Clusters Programme - Uganda (ISCP-U): The Project works with SMEs, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, private sector and the academia (largely from CEDAT) to bring together people dealing in the same economic activity and operating in the same geographic location. The cluster groups
work together with the academia to improve the quality of the products and get better market, and in so doing improve incomes. Some of the cluster groups that have benefited from this partnership are the Katwe Metal Cluster, Mbarara Milk Cluster, Lira Bee Cluster, Kayunga Pineapple Cluster, Katwe Salt Cluster, and Basketry Cluster. Through the Programme 50 solar hybrid dryers for Kayunga Pineapple Cluster were upgraded to improve on heat content. Further, fully scaled up Industrial Project for the Kaliro Fish Processing Plant was designed to deal with seeds multiplications, productions, feeds making and processing units. This Project has been submitted to the United Nations Capital Development Fund and is also being marketed among individual firms.

x. The ISCP-U initiative has improved the training of engineering human resource with relevant skills, improved research infrastructure, developed business incubation facilities to support commercialisation of ideas from Student and Staff and enhanced the understanding and appreciation of the role of S&T in the development process, especially among the young generation. The initiative especially under the Technology Transfer and Development Centre and the Clusters programme has developed viable prototypes targeting SMEs product development and business processes.

xi. **Research in diapers**: the Makapads project has continued to expand the range of products. Makapads were manufactured using bio-degradable materials and have since 2010 benefited over 200 Primary and Secondary Schools in Uganda.

The research on Makapads has progressed into designing of the Maternity Bed Pads, which have been tested in selected hospitals and maternity clinics in Kampala and Wakiso Districts.

The Team is currently doing research on how to make diapers for babies using bio-degradable materials.

2. **Research Projects funded by Development Partners**

Over the years, the University has enhanced research networks and widened her research funding portfolio. The top 10 high volume funders between 2008- and 2016 were: USAID, Presidential Initiative for STI, Master Card Foundation, ADELPHI, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Centre for Disease Control, National Institute of Health, Welcome Trust, European Union, and the Swedish Development Agency (SIDA). The research grants are either given to individual staff members or specific academic units. Development partners have also provided grants for staff capacity development. In 2016, the University had more than USD 25m worth of running projects. Whereas several of the Projects are multi-year projects from partners, the Makerere-Sida Bilateral Research Programme, NORHED and the Carnegie Corporation stand out as household names in supporting the University in capacity-building and research.

For instance, through the Makerere-Sida Bilateral Research Programme; the Government of Sweden has been supporting Makerere University Research thrust since 2000. To date over 200 University staff have attained PhDs and more than 300 research projects have been undertaken in heath, engineering and technology, agriculture and the humanities in collaboration with Universities in Sweden. Research infrastructure has been boosted with several laboratories, including the biotechnology laboratory in CHS, the water resources and the GIS labs in CEDAT as well as the Demographic Surveillance Site in Mayuge. Total investment over the 15-year period is to the tune of US$ 73.3 million. The fourth phase of
Sida support to Makerere University worth US$ 32 million commenced with the signing of the agreement on 3rd November 2015. The focus of the five-year programme is human resource development at Post–doctoral, PhD and Master level targeting Staff of Makerere University, Kyambogo University, Gulu University, Busitema University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology. The program builds on earlier support aimed at strengthening and enhance the capacity of public universities in Uganda to generate knowledge and promote research uptake for national and regional development.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York approved the sum of $1,000,000 to Makerere University to fund a research project “Nurturing Emerging Research Leaders through Post-Doctoral Training (NERLP 2017-2019)”. The project aims at grooming fresh PhD holders into research leaders to create a community of scholars as well as provide opportunities for mentoring. This will improve the quality of supervision and publication scholarship, and contribute to the strategic direction of Makerere University. A total of 15 post-doctoral fellowship will benefit from this project.

Figure 5.6.3c shows the top 10 beneficiaries of grants and grants received in Million USD between 2010 and 2018.

![Figure 5.6.3c: Top Researchers and Grants Received in Million USD for the Period 2010-2018](Source: Committee Primary Data 2016/17)

### 5.6.5 Intellectual Property Management Policy (IPM)

The 2016-2017 Global Competitiveness Report (World Economic Forum, 2016), points out that of the 138 countries, Uganda is ranked 77th with regard to Innovation and 104th in terms of intellectual property protection. This dismal global picture is partly reflected at Makerere University among other players, as follows:

1. Despite several innovations the Intellectual Property Management Policy (IPMP) approved by the University Council has not been operationalised. The University does not have an Intellectual Property (IP) Register, consequently, several innovations have not been registered with Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) to engender commercialisation; and cannot therefore be patented. The Committee with concern notes very limited documentation on patenting of the outputs from Research and Innovations at Makerere University.

2. The Committee found limited information on IPRs registered either by the University or individual staff members. However, the several innovations (highlighted in Subsection 5.6.2 of this Report) and IPRs at Makerere University were generated from CHS, CAES and CEDAT, with low output from the Business, Arts and Humanities.
disciplines. These disciplines placed emphasis on undergraduate teaching with minimal premium on research and innovation.

(3) Makerere University did not have a Patent and Licensing Office, a global best practice. This Office provides a platform for the commercialisation of University Research and Innovation.

The Committee found the following best practice benchmarks useful. The University-wide Intellectual Property Policy (IPP) at Harvard governs the ownership and handling of IP arising from research and other activities. Among others, the policy defines which IP will be owned by Harvard and sets out the rights and obligations of Harvard researchers with respect to that IP (for example, the reporting of inventions, release of inventions by Harvard to inventors and the sharing of revenues derived from commercialisation of Harvard-owned IP). The Office of Technology Development (OTD) is responsible for implementing the IP Policy with respect to inventions, software and other materials that arise from Harvard research activities. The University and its Schools have also adopted other policies concerning IPM and the development and licensing of technology. The OTD is responsible for the strategic management and commercial development of all technologies, and intellectual property (IP) arising from Harvard University’s research enterprise. This includes industry liaison and outreach, IP protection, business development, technology transfer, and the formation of startup companies and new ventures around Harvard technology platforms and projects. The OTD is also responsible for generating, structuring, and negotiating research alliances and collaborations with industry and industry-sponsored research funding for Harvard faculty.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) has a very active Committee on Intellectual Property. The Committee recommends to the administration policy guidelines for intellectual property, including patents, copyrights, and agreements. It considers issues of ownership and distribution of MIT intellectual property, conflict of interest, and MIT-industry interactions. Its policy recommendations balance a desire to transfer MIT technology to industry or other institutions for the public good, with a need to maintain an environment at MIT that promotes openness and excellence in education and research.

The clear governance of research and innovation at these US universities enables them to stay atop of the world university rankings.

Unlike in the US where Universities manage their own IPRs, Cuba has a Government-sponsored agency that protects the IPs of academic innovations. The Agency is under the Entrepreneurship Unit which offers services to the Ministry of Higher Education and to the universities. Although the IPs belong to the individual intellectuals (unless otherwise specified), the IP process is managed by a University Board mandated to determine the IP procedure. This Board works in partnership with the State’s IP Agency. Noteworthy, Patents are another source income to fund higher education institutions in Cuba.

5.6.4 Challenges in the advancement of Research and Innovation

The Committee noted:

(1) **Internal Research Funds**: Less than one per cent (1%) of IGF is allocated to Research and Innovation at Makerere University. This particularly affects Academic Units which do not attract external research grants (highlighted in Subsection 5.6.3 of this Report).

(2) **Grants as major source of funding**: Majority of the Research Projects, Innovations and Centres of Excellence are funded by external agencies with externally dictated funding themes. This likely truncates research efforts into serving mainly the interests
of external funders and also compromising the protection of indigenous knowledge and practices.

(3) **Absence of a Research Grant Management Policy:** A Research Grant Management Policy provides high level guidance regarding proposal development, approval, financial and personnel management, and ethical and regulatory compliance. This is accompanied by a detailed Handbook which specifies the rules, procedures and guidelines within which projects arising from grants are supposed to operate.

a. Currently, projects/grants management within the University is highlighted in two documents being (i) the Finance Manual and (ii) the Research and Innovations Policy. The provisions of the Finance Manual are generic and limited to how funds will be received and accounted for. The Manual is also silent about the other aspects of financial management such as grant financial reporting. The Manual has no mention of the non-financial aspects, such as personnel management and grant acceptance.

b. It is critical to note that the University assumes liability and risk on behalf of all research projects undertaken, therefore having a well laid down policy and guidelines are crucial to both the University and the funders.

c. In the absence of a Policy and Standard Operating Procedures to guide the operations of grants/projects, proper implementation is dependent on the integrity of the Principal Investigators who source for the funding.

d. Failure to streamline the budgeting, expenditure and reporting aspects of the grants within the main University systems exposes the University to several risks. These may include but not limited to: duplication of efforts, abuse of resources, noncompliance with donor requirements, ethical and regulatory violations, and exposure to litigation, loss of donor goodwill and a tainted reputation.

(4) Inadequacy of the Grants Office to coordinate and streamline research and innovation activities at Makerere University.

(5) Few Science-based Colleges are engaged in research; most academics in the Business, Arts and Humanities focus on teaching *(ref. to Table 5.6.2 and Figure 5.6.3c)*.

(6) Graduate training is entirely privately sponsored, with limited government funding, leading to very low participation *(also refer to McGregor Report, 2007)*.

(7) High graduate students to supervisor ratios leading to clogging of the system, low completion and graduation rates.

(8) Weak relationship between graduate training, research and innovation programmes.

(9) Limited research on policy impact and implementation, inventions and patents registered, businesses developed, technologies transfer, and startup companies and new ventures formed around Makerere University technology platforms and research projects.

(10) Academic staff in some of the academic units were not aware of the existence of a University Research Agenda and those who had heard about it noted absence of deliberate effort by the University to fund the Agenda at College level.

(11) Even with donor support, there was lack of an integrated research plan with specific targets and timeframes against which targets were measured. Moreover, there was no
management structure to monitor and evaluate the progress of ongoing research projects. Further, there was no established institutional infrastructure to manage and allocate funds, coordinate and review research activities across Colleges, or evaluate research progress across disciplines over agreed timeframes.

(12) Whereas research teams are critical for building strong research universities, the University had no known guideline to institutionalise and operationalise both disciplinary and multidisciplinary teams. Such research teams are essential for building strong peer networks that can yield equally robust grant applications given the diverse disciplinary backgrounds of team members.

(13) Despite efforts to strengthen support of the research function at College level through establishment of College Grants Offices who are mandated to coordinate and support academic staff in research grant proposal writing, the Visitation Committee learnt that in some of the Colleges the Grants Offices have been less effective given lack of seed funds to operationalise them. Moreover, there is no formal appointment of Staff in the College Grants Offices making it difficult to have them functional.

(14) Limited centralized up-to-date documentation of researches published by Staff in nationally and internationally referred journals, and in Book chapters, Monographs; papers presented in international conferences, in research symposia and workshops at national/institutional level; Staff facilitated seminars and colloquia, and exhibitions.

(15) The Committee also noted that most of the challenges related to teaching and learning highlighted in Subsection 5.4, especially inadequate staffing levels, and limited facilities, equipment and specimen, significantly affect the advancement of the University’s Research and Innovations Agenda.

(16) From a SWOT Analysis of the Research and Innovations Communication Strategy (RICS, 2015) Regime several weaknesses and threats to research and innovations were highlighted and a number of these (some of which are of strategic nature) had not been addressed by the University by the time the Committee visited.

5.7 RECOMMENDATIONS ON RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

5.7.1 National Strategy for Research and Innovation

The Government should develop a strategy for Research and Innovations, a commitment to a set of coherent, mutually reinforcing policies aimed at achieving a specific competitive goal. The Strategy should aim at promoting alignment among the research and innovation community, clarify objectives and priorities, and help focus and consolidate research and innovation efforts. Guided by the National Development Plan (NDPII) and Vision 2040 the Strategy could have thematic areas identified for research and innovations to be funded every five years. After every five years, new thematic areas should be identified and supported. There should be national dissemination platforms on the research findings.

5.7.2 National Research and Innovation Fund

The interventions by Government such as the Millennium Science Initiative, the Presidential Initiative on S&T are commended. Government should sustainably operationalise the Research and Innovation Fund and scale it from the initial commitment of UGX 500 billion to catalyze Research and Innovation at national level. The revolving Fund should be competed for nationally by education and research institutions in both the public and private domains, encouraging multi-disciplinary teams of academics, researchers, students and practitioners, including inventors and industrialists. The Kenya National Research Fund and
Singapore National Research Foundations provide some examples. The Fund shall enable Government to implement and monitor the National Research and Innovation Strategy.

5.7.3 **Strengthen Structures and Systems supporting Research and Innovation at Makerere University**

In the short-term, Makerere University should strengthen the coordination and support structures for research and innovation by:

1. Fast tracking the operationalisation of the Intellectual Property Management Policy to enhance the University’s intellectual property as an intangible asset, minimise unexpected risk and generate income for the University.

2. Restructure the Directorate of Research & Graduate Training into the Directorate of Graduate Training; and the Directorate of Research, Innovations and Intellectual Property.

3. Create a Patent and Licensing Office to streamline commercialisation of University research and innovations, and associated intellectual property management. This Office should be under the proposed Directorate of Research, Innovation and Intellectual Property.

4. To enhance the development of indigenous knowledge, Makerere University should leverage the liberation movements’ experiences of Uganda and other African Nations to put in place the Africa Centre for Strategic and Policy Studies (ACSPS) in the field of Social Sciences.

5. Ring-fencing up to 20% of the University’s total annual budget for research and innovation.

6. Deliberately creating strong linkages among teaching, research and innovation and knowledge transfer partnerships and networking to inform and continuously improve the other.

7. Operationalising the Rewards and Recognition Policy to recognise outstanding researchers such as Professors: William Bazeeyo, Nelson Sewankambo, David Sserwada, Erasmus Barifaijo, Edward K. Kirumira, Moses Kamya, Miseki Wayengera, Musoke Phillipa Mudido, Wanyenze Rhoda Kitti, among others.

5.7.4 **Focus on Graduate Training and Research**

1. The University should implement its Strategic Plan to be a research-led University. As the Premier University in Uganda and in Africa; the focus should shift to Graduate Training and Research. Makerere University should not compete with other Universities in Uganda for undergraduate training in certain disciplines such as Education, Business, Arts and the Humanities. The focus in these disciplines should be on Graduate Training and Research.

2. There should be a clear performance-based system for the supervision of graduate students and timely completion of graduate students. Each senior Academic should be given a minimum number of students to supervise and their completion schedules.

5.8 **FINDINGS ON KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PARTNERSHIPS & NETWORKING**

The Committee studied and analysed the progress made on the third core function of Makerere University, i.e. Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking. The University Strategic Plan (2007/08-2017/18) envisioned a paradigm shift from outreach to KTPs and
Networking as a means of cultivating and fostering of symbiotic relationship between the University and her stakeholders.

The University outlined two goals upon which it would realise this strategic pillar: “to create an enabling environment for public and private sector interface in the promotion of education in a competitive setting”; and “to provide a partnership framework for assessment and utilisation of University products in the value chain”. The strategic objectives for Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking in the current Strategic Plan are as follows:

1. To improve the visibility of Makerere University in Outreach & Community Development,
2. To improve Government access to pro-policy services, knowledge & advice from Makerere University,
3. To improve Community access to knowledge and skills, advice, technology & innovations from Makerere University,
4. To enhance Makerere University’s competitive position as a technology development & referral institution for vocational & community development,
5. To harmonise and institutionalise outreach service and consultancy coordination,
6. To establish educational and cultural Centres, e.g. museums, gallery, herbarium, and
7. To engender all outreach programmes (Makerere University Fact Book, 2016).

It was envisaged that there would be increase in public and private sector participation in University activities; increase in joint research, technology innovation and transfer initiatives to address stakeholder needs, and utilisation of University competencies by the public and private sectors.

The University has a number of Science and Technology cross-cutting Research Centres nationally spread. These Centres are expected to be hubs for knowledge transfer to the benefit of the surrounding communities.

Engagement and dialogue with communities and environments is fundamental to the relevance of the University. The role of communities to influence academic provision and research manifests through such partnerships. The partnerships connect higher education, industry, community and global partners, and link local to the global knowledge practices. Through KTPs and Networking, Makerere University has gained mileage and exposure to real life situations that enhance learning by staff and students. During the academic year (2015/16), the University registered KTPs in the areas of

In the Makerere University Institutional Portfolio on Research, Innovations and Partnerships Report (2017), the focus areas for 2015/2016 were included governance, public health, engineering, science and technology in the public and private sectors, and at local, national and international partnership levels. More specifically, the University interacted with various districts to address health-related challenges, in addition to attending conferences, seminar series, and participating in community service and international partnerships. However, the Committee noted that most KTPs were linked to research and innovations (refer to Subsection 5.6 of this Report) and a few on teaching and graduate skills development.

Through KTPs and Networking, Makerere University has gained mileage and exposure to real life situations that enhance learning by Staff and Students. The University has registered KTPs and networks in the areas of governance, public health, engineering, science and
technology in the public and private sectors and at local, national and international partnerships levels. Most KTPs are linked to research and innovations and graduate training and a few on teaching and graduate skills development.

5.8.1 Notable Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking Activities

(1) Supported by the University Policy Guidelines of 2009, partnership and networks have been enhanced through institutionalisation of activities such as field attachment/internship placements, and supervision of students on internship on all undergraduate programmes. Students in their second, third and fourth years spend 4-8 weeks in real-life settings putting into practice the knowledge acquired at the University.

(2) Conferences and Seminar series: Makerere University has hosted a number of national and international conferences and seminars to allow participants discuss new ideas, opportunities targeting solutions to societal challenges. Among these included the 9th Annual Regional Collaboration Conference on “Research and Innovations forum for sustainable regional development: Over a decade of Swedish Partnership” which brought together researchers from Uganda, Tanzania, Mozambique and Sweden.

(3) Partnerships and networks linking the University to Community: Makerere University has several partnerships and networks and has over time signed several MoUs with Government Institutions, Funding Agencies, Philanthropic Organisations and Training Institutions at local, regional and international levels, with countries such as the US, Germany, Switzerland, Netherlands, Denmark, Japan, North Korea, Israel, Sweden, Norway, Finland, China, Turkey, Iran and South Africa. Among the several Partnerships and Networks in 2016 documented in the Report on Makerere University Institutional Portfolio on Research, Innovations and Partnerships (2017) include the following:

   a) Medical Camps by CHS: in local governments addressing health challenges in the communities and exposing staff and students to real life situations at the point of service delivery. For example, in the Katanga medical camp approximately 302 patients were served; while in the Mubende Region Surgical Camp faculty members and postgraduate students actively participated in offering surgical services in Mubende Regional Referral Hospital (RRH), Mityana Hospital, Kiganda HC IV and Ntwetwe HC IV. Over 300 operations were carried out and 1000 consultations were made.

   b) Telematics Receiving Studio: a partnership among Makerere University, Stellenbosch University (South Africa) and Jomo Kenyatta University (Kenya). The Studio supports Food Science and Human Nutrition training at the University. The initiative is supported by the European Union – Edulink II project: Partnerships to Strengthen University Food and Nutrition Sciences training and Research in Eastern and Southern Africa.

(4) Forest Reformation and Climate Improvement, students from COVAB and CAES participated in planting trees to mark the World Record Planting of 10,000 bamboo trees in 1 hour in Kayunga District. Trees were planted around the University by Staff and Students in commemoration of the World Earth Day 2016, under the theme “Trees for the Earth”.

(5) The School of Law successfully engaged the Supreme Court in an amicus curiae application, where staff from the School were admitted as friends of Court in the
Presidential Petition. This was to provide expertise and civic obligations as legal academics for the benefit of the public.

The School has continued to provide pro bono services in legal issues to the public so as to foster greater engagement of lawyers in public interest litigation and advocacy, carry out training and awareness sessions. In 2016, four communities benefited from these services, i.e. Katanga, Kikubamutwe, Kivulu and Kikoni. In addition, the School has introduced Community Law Programme and Mobile Law Clinic (CLAPMOC) to promote the University’s commitment to promoting community outreach activities and to train Students using practical and hands-on approaches. Two field offices in Nakivale and Kyangwali Refugee settlements were established. Kyangwali Refugee Settlement was gazetted as a magisterial area, a development that promises to bring legal services closer to the refugee population.

(6) The University through the Guidance and Counseling Centre established partnerships with a number of organisations and universities (including Florida State University, Human Resources Association of Uganda, Association of University and College Counseling Centre Directors, IREX, DESIGN lab based in the USA, National Career Development Association). Through the partnerships, a PhD student in career counseling trained 20 staff as Career Advisors. The staff also received scholarships from the American Group Psychotherapy Association (AGPA) and the Israel Anti-Drug Authority that enabled the staff to attend the American Group Psychotherapy conference and the substance abuse management training in Jerusalem, Israel.

(7) Centre for Tobacco Control in Africa (CTCA): established at Makerere University in July 2011 by WHO, with funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to provide technical and institutional support to governments in Africa in policy formulation, legislation and enforcement of tobacco control, and in building and sustaining institutional capacity for tobacco control. At continental level, CTCA provided technical assistance in the enactment of a comprehensive tobacco control law in one of CTCA’s target countries, Government of The Gambia. The Gambia joins Uganda as the second country to establish the Tobacco Control Law in Africa.

(8) Africa Hub: a coalition of seven Schools of Public Health in Eastern Africa focuses on strengthening capacity for Health Systems Research (HSR) in Africa. Africa Hub launched a Regional Training course in HSR to build capacity for design and conduct of health systems research, communicate evidence, analyse and apply health systems research evidence for better policy and decision making.

(9) Infectious Diseases Institute (IDI): Mak Outreach Programme has supported HIV/AIDS prevention, care and treatment services in the seven districts of mid-Western Uganda (Kiboga, Kyankwanzi, Kibaale, Hoima, Masindi, Buliisa and Kiryandongo) using the Health Sector Support approach since 2008. The districts have been supported to provide an enriched HIV prevention care and treatment package that includes: HIV prevention messages; risk reduction counseling for HIV negatives; positive health, dignity and prevention for the HIV positives. The (2015-20) phase titled “Accelerating Comprehensive HIV/ AIDS Service Delivery through Health Systems Capacity Building and Technical Assistance to District Health Teams and Health Facilities in the Western Region of Uganda” focuses on Bunyoro region.

Building Capacity through the IDI-Kampala Capital City Authority Twinning Programme: The twinning programme is an innovative mentorship approach started by the PCT Programme to specifically strengthen the capacity of Kampala Capital
City Authority (KCCA) nursing staff to manage HIV-infected special patient populations consisting young adults, the elderly, discordant couples as well as TB/HIV co-infected and integrated HIV sexual reproductive services. The Programme is running in the KCCA clinics of Kitebi, Komamboga, Kisugu, Kiswa, Kisenyi and Kawempe Home Care.

(10) Maternal and Neonatal Implementation for Equitable Systems (MANIFEST): is a project aimed at improving maternal and newborn indicators in the districts of Kamuli, Kibuku and Pallisa using locally available resources. The study largely implemented community mobilisation and sensitisation, and health systems strengthening activities. The trained 1,691 community health workers continued visiting homes to educate families on birth preparedness and how to take care of mothers and new-born babies in their respective communities. The community dialogues have moved from village level meetings to the smaller saving groups to facilitate meaningful dialogue. The MANIFEST radio talk shows were integrated into existing talk shows. By November 2015, all the formed 1500 savings groups had funds for supporting maternal and child healthcare needs including payment for routine and referral transport.

(11) Africa Institute for Strategic Services and Development: Makerere’s efforts to impart Skills in Ntungamo District, Africa Institute for Strategic Services and Development (AFRISA) in partnership with Ntungamo Transformation Initiative (NTI) equipped farmers of Rukoni sub county, Ntungamo district with various relevant skills to enable them increase productivity, improve quality and create demand for their produce. The training took place over eight months and a total of 169 farmers were awarded general artisan certificates in six disciplines of Fish industry and business, Pig industry and business, Poultry industry and business, Bee industry and business, Dairy industry and business, and Zootechnics and agro entrepreneurship.

(12) Efforts to Comprehend Gender Dynamics: The School of Women and Gender Studies launched an outreach training programme aimed at creating a formidable force of intellectuals with the ability to comprehend gender dynamics, plan and advocate for gender equality from an informed position. Eleven Isis-WICCE staff successfully completed a three-months training in feminism and gender analysis.

(13) COCIS and Family Tree: the College collaborated with familysearch.org to boost usage of its Family tree platform to help people create lineages of their families. A team from familysearch.org met the Principal COCIS and discussed a working partnership. The familysearch.org platform uses innovations in ICT by COCIS to make it widely adopted and used in Uganda.

(14) Makerere University Zoonoses and Biosecurity Centre (MAZOBIC) at COVAB in partnership with the NORAD-CAPAZOMANINTECO Project, the Government of Uganda, University of Zurich-Switzerland, University of Colorado State-USA and USAID. MAZOBIC is tasked with surveillance of disease in animal, humans and ecosystems; Vaccine production and development of locally tailored vaccines for zoonotic diseases and emerging threats; Research and development; and Establishment of comprehensive biosecurity plan for community transformation.

(15) Global Health Service Partnerships: to enhance the quality of health professional’s education in Uganda, CHS partnered with Peace Corps Uganda to enhance the training of health professionals’ educators. The College has trained 24 nurses and
physicians from different specialties who were distributed by Peace Corps Uganda as volunteers to health professionals’ training institutions across the country to help fill the gap for teachers. The volunteers were equipped with training skills, treating patients with minimal resources and prepared to serve in other health professional institutions in Uganda for a period of 1 year.

(16) **Makerere’ quadripartite MoU to enhance Tororo Fertiliser Production:** Makerere University signed a quadripartite Memorandum of Understanding with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), South China Agricultural University (SCAU) and Guangzhou Dongsong Energy Group Company Ltd. in Guangzhou, China. The MoU was meant to operationalise the “Carbonatite Comprehensive Industrial Development Project in Sukulu Hills Tororo, Uganda” that will manufacture phosphate fertilisers among other products.

### 5.8.2 Challenges in the Implementation of KTPs and Networking

Despite the above commendable efforts, the Committee notes the following:-

1. **Policy and Structures for KTP:** There are inadequate guidelines for KTPs and Networking; these are in the Research & Innovations Policy, Research Dissemination Strategy, and the IPM Policy, implying absence of a comprehensive policy and structure on this 3rd core function of the University. Although there is KTPs Unit under the Directorate of Research and Graduate Training (DRGT), but it is inactive.

2. **Central Coordinating Office:** There was no central coordinating office for KTPs and Networking, and no known Committee established to nurture this function *(ref. to Midterm Review Report, 2017)*. Besides, information on the existing KTPs activities, areas to focus on, and potential KTPs partners that the University would work with was fuzzy.

3. **Incubation Policy:** The Committee commends the University for setting up several incubation centers. However, there was absence of an Incubation Policy and centralised business incubation coordination centre.

4. **Institutional coordination mechanism of internship activities:** Although there was evidence of Internship on all undergraduate programmes, there was no institutional coordination mechanism of Internship activities at Makerere University.

5. **Industrial-University Partnerships:** There was a gap between the University and the private and public sectors that would have otherwise strengthened industry-academia links by enhancing University knowledge transfer initiatives with industry. This was also confirmed in the Public Dialogue the Committee organised.

6. **University Career Centre(s):** there was absence of a University Career Centre(s) to link students and graduates to the labour market, and equip them with the right tools and essential soft skills required for professional practice.

### 5.9 RECOMMENDATIONS ON KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PARTNERSHIPS

In the short to mid-term, Makerere University should strengthen and scale-up Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking by considering the following:

1. This KTPs and Networking Office should be under the proposed Directorate of Research, Innovation and Intellectual Property with a mandate to coordinate knowledge transfer partnerships and networking, link research to development and ensure that all KTPs engagements by the University and her academic units are
institutionalised. This Office should work closely with the Patents and Licensing Office.

(2) Establish Industry Advisory Boards (IAB) to link influential professionals and recognised leaders in industry to the University to participate as guest lecturers to provide industrial perspective to training.

(3) Support Academic Staff to undergo Faculty Industry Attachment (FIA) programmes where they are seconded to top industry partners for several months. Through this they gain an in-depth understanding of the current demands of the job market, which knowledge is useful in improving the quality and relevance of training programmes and research.

(4) Establish a University Career Centre to link students and graduates to the labour market, and equip them with the right tools and essential soft skills required for professional practice. The Centre should be centrally managed, but with Units at College level.

(5) Review the Internship Programme as part of the on-going curriculum restructuring process, to address issues of relevance and management.
CHAPTER SIX: STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Student Affairs and Services function in higher education deliver professional services and programmes for the enhancement of students’ learning and success (UNESCO, 2009). It is an international best practice for higher education institutions to have structures and systems to support students typically delivering services and programmes including but not limited to:

(1) Academic Advising/Education Counseling
(2) Academic Support Centers
(3) Adult/Non-Traditional/Commuter Student Services
(4) Alumni Relations in Student Affairs
(5) Bookstore Services
(6) Call Centers
(7) Campus Activities/Student Organizations (Student Guild and Associations)
(8) Campus Security/Police and Protection Services
(9) Chaplaincy and Multi-Faith Services
(10) Child Care
(11) Community Service/Service Learning
(12) Dining/Food Services
(13) Disability Services
(14) Discipline/Conduct Standards
(15) Financial Aid/Employment Services
(16) Health and Wellness Services
(17) Housing/Accommodations and Residence Life
(18) International Programmes/Student Mobility Services Management
(19) International Students Services
(20) Leadership Education, Training, Development and Support
(21) Multicultural and Minority Students Services
(22) New Student Programmes/Student Orientation
(23) Parents/Guardians Programmes
(24) Sports/Recreation/Intramurals
(25) Student Recruitment/School Relations Services
(26) Student Registration and Records
(27) Women Student Support Centers

The Committee undertook to assess the extent to which Makerere University has instituted structures and systems to deliver a complete student experience and achievement. It was noted that indeed there are several structures and systems delivering student services at Makerere University. However, much more is required to ensure student satisfaction with the services and programmes provided on top of the need to reinforce the delivery of these programmes to be all inclusive.

In analysing the situation pertaining to student affairs and services at Makerere University, the Committee reviewed the findings and recommendations of previous Committees; visited and toured several student service centers (halls of residence, hostels, main campus and student facilities at Mulago, Buyana and Kabanyolo); interfaced with the Student Guild; carried out a student head count to verify the student population at Makerere University and a Study on Causes of Student Discontent, Triggers of Strikes and Satisfaction with Services
and Programmes. The subsections of this Report that follow provide an in-depth presentation of the findings and recommendations.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS BY PREVIOUS COMMITTEES

6.2.1 The McGregor Report 2007

In the wake of rising levels of discontent at Makerere University that brought into play quite a number of strikes among Students and Staff on the backdrop of avid efforts to realize the World Bank position for both commercialization of University services and simultaneous expansion of access for inclusion by gender and increasing outflows from the schools streams the McGregor Committee was appointed.

The McGregor Committee among its terms of reference was mandated to report on the status quo of the students’ management at Makerere University, specifically to report on the health and security conditions of existing provisions for non-resident students. Subsequently the Councils of the respective Universities and the Senior Administrators were tasked to review arrangements for security and health care of students, living on or near University Campuses.

The McGregor Committee further recommended as follows:

1. Divesture of the running of Halls of residence so as to optimise resources for core academic activities such that the Universities be relieved of the responsibilities of financing and providing residential and catering facilities for students and contract them to approved, experienced companies which should be able to offer consistently good services at reasonable prices.

2. All stakeholders (Government, Students, Parents, Donors, among others) should assist universities by ensuring that promised funds are paid promptly at the agreed times throughout the year, to enable the universities to meet their financial obligations on time, thereby avoid debt and staff/ student protests.

3. The reviewing of all communication channels between administration, academic support Staff and Students as per recommendations of NCHE and UNESCO.

4. An early introduction of a credit transfer system be effected as recommended by the NCHE.

5. The above recommendations except for the partial divesture of management of students’ hall to service providers with respect to meals were largely not implemented at Makerere University, citing inadequate financing.

6.2.2 The White Paper on the McGregor Visitation Committee, 2008

The following issues on the management of Students were noted in the White Paper;

1. The Council and senior administrators should thoroughly review arrangements for the security and healthcare of students, living on or off University campuses.

2. Universities should privatize the management of Halls of Residence and service therein as learnt from sister institutions in the region which have proved successful.

3. In order to mitigate discrepancies in access to higher education, Government should introduce an equitable Student loan scheme based on a MEANS TEST on the lines of those operating successful loan schemes. The recommendation was accepted by Government but has been partially implemented since the loan scheme to date only caters for Science students.
The Committee noted that:

(1) Dismal progress has been made on implementation of recommendation (1).

(2) The University has privatized Student meals services in the Halls of Residence. It was however observed that as international best practice universities typically provide accommodation for only first year students on campus and this should be upheld by Makerere University. It was also noted that the biggest portion of the Student population reside in private hostels in the neighborhood of Makerere University, the Committee did not obtain any record of accreditation of the private hostels. It is also imperative to note that the Halls of Residence are quite dilapidated with some like Block C of Lumumba no longer fit for residence. All Halls of Residence require urgent attention for rehabilitation. The residences at Buyana need to be completely overhauled to meet the basic requirements for accommodation.

(3) Government has instituted a student loan scheme managed by the Higher Education Students’ Financing Board providing loans for students on STEM programmes.

6.2.3 The Kabaasa Report, 2013

The Kabaasa Report was an internal report of Council whose main objective was to streamline and harmonize financial emoluments across the entire University with a view to getting rid of the ‘wet and dry College syndrome’ and thereby help stem discontent among Staff. This Report had no communication in particular that concerned Student Affairs. However, the following was recommended with regard to Students academic affairs:

…as a means of cutting costs the internship program should be utilized in maintaining the university roads and painting of the university buildings. Sufficient funds be provided for this purpose.

6.3 LEGAL, REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORKS ON STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES

6.3.1 The Uganda Vision 2040

(1) The Uganda Vision 2040 on the education sector focused largely on Science, Technology, Engineering and Innovation (STEI) Education and Literacy. Below are the foreseen items for the Vision 2040, in line with higher institutions of learning. Indeed the following is stated in para 222

Government will support Innovation financing by introducing special grants, loan and guarantee for start-ups and new firms as well as subsidies and tax incentives to stimulate research and development in the public and private sectors.

(2) Government supported tertiary education will be devoted to skills development according to the talents and aptitudes identified. Students will be accorded opportunities to excel in whichever skills area they are placed. These will range from sports and the arts, to technical and vocational, to research and academic pursuit. National service will also be introduced to promote work ethics, patriotism and voluntarism. The entire education system will be changed to emphasize practical skills, aptitude and moral values. Undergraduate courses will include a full year of internship in addition to course specific industrial training in order to produce a human resource that is ready for the workplace.
(3) The education curriculum, examination and instruction methods will be revised to suit the proposed changes in the education system as well as be responsive to the market demands. Talent identification will be an ongoing exercise throughout the education system so that the system is robust enough to capture and nurture excellence and innovation at point.

(4) On page (xiv) while spelling out some of the core national projects, the Uganda Vision 2040 stipulates that government shall: “Develop and implement a specific policy to attract and retain top rated professionals in the Universities to make Uganda a Center of Excellence in Education in the region…”


Under the NDPII it was observed that public funding to HE remains at 0.3% of GDP which is below the recommended share of at least 1%. The provided funding does not match the demand, as student numbers are increasing by an annual average of over 10%. The low staff level at the public universities standing at an average of 33% of establishment lowers the quality of service delivery.

6.3.3 The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act 2001 as amended

The UOTIA 2001 as amended, provides the constitutional framework for governance of tertiary institutions. The Act comments about Student Affairs under the Students’ Association Sections of the Act; i.e.: Section 69 (1) is about the criteria of admission to the Association. It is further stated in Section 92 as follows:

(1) **There shall be a Students’ Association which shall be constituted in accordance with regulations made for that purpose by the Governing Council.**

(2) **The Students’ Association may make its own Constitution with the approval of the Governing Council.**

The Act grants the University increased autonomy, since the Head of State (President) ceased to be the *de facto* University Chancellor. Consequently, internal systemic restructuring has been implemented following the path of strategic planning, among other reform initiatives (Nakanyike & Nasozi, 2001).

The Committee observed that the NCHE has not yet made regulations or undertaken visitation pertaining to the delivery of Student Affairs and Services. The NCHE also not established standards for ethical conduct of Students in higher education institutions.

6.3.4 The Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constitute Colleges of Makerere University) Statute 2012

This Statute considered admission of Students into the University, leaving out all other aspects that matter to Student Affairs. It is noted in Part IV, Section 10, that admission of Students to a College shall be open to all qualified citizens of Uganda and without discrimination.

6.3.5 Makerere Strategic Plan 2008/19-2018/19

It is stated in the Makerere Strategic Plan that in order to operationalize its support functions, the University will over the next ten years:

(1) Ensure Makerere University’s competitiveness in attracting, recruiting and retention of high quality human resource is realized;

(2) Augment efficient provision and utilization of library services;

(3) Ensure an efficient and effective organizational and management environment;
(4) Develop her infrastructure to match her functions;
(5) Consolidate the ICT enabling environment;
(6) Move towards attaining financial sustainability;
(7) Ensure optimal utilization of the University’s financial resources; and
(8) Improve the academic and social development of staff and students.

Further, the University Council adopted a participatory planning process starting with the formulation of a Makerere Strategic Framework by the Strategic Planning Group of key stakeholders in the University. Input was drawn from the students among other stakeholders.

*Although most emphasis was put on governance and service delivery within the University, less focus was put on the Students’ welfare and therefore on the Student as the primary consumer of the University services.*

6.3.6 The Makerere University Fees Policy, 2016

In order to ensure organized process of fees collection from private students guided by its strategic plan, drafted and operationalized the Makerere University fees Policy which states among other things:

*Makerere University is committed to providing the best service to her students to ensure that they get the best higher education experience from the University. In order to achieve this, the University raises financial resources from different sources, including tuition and functional fees, charges for use of University facilities, endowments and donations. Tuition and functional fees payable by students form an important component of the University’s financial resources. Fees are used to top up staff salaries, external examiners, utilities, teaching materials and other requirements.*

Under Section B of the **Legal Framework the Policy states that** fees payable by Students shall be fixed by the University Council in accordance with Article 41(c) of the Universities and Other Institutions Act (UOTIA) of 2001, as amended and may be reviewed from time to time. The main objectives of the policy spelt out in Section C include:

(1) To ensure the setting of fees is compliant with Government regulations while supporting strategic and financial imperatives.
(2) To ensure that additional charges levied are compliant with the legal requirements while ensuring coverage of legitimate costs.
(3) To provide clarity regarding the requirements for administration, invoicing, collection and refund of fees.

The Policy further spelt out the scope under Section D follows: This policy applies to all categories of fees chargeable for services to students of Makerere University for programmes of study. The guiding principles are under Section E; but of profound significance to Student’s perception of fees and charges to date appears to be Section G: Fees Regulation which under the general provisions states as follows:

(1) Payment of University fees is the responsibility of students. An account shall be opened for each student in the computerized information system of the University. Students who default on the payment of fees are subject to sanctions, including de-registration, payment of a fine and legal action.
(2) Fees are due on the first day of each semester.
(3) All students admitted for programmes at the University are personally responsible for the payment of fees. This includes arrangements where students obtain sponsorship for fees and the sponsor defaults.
(4) The specific fee applicable is confirmed at the point of admission.
(5) When there is a review between admission and registration, the applicable fee will be that given to the students at the time of registration.
(6) Students repeating a course unit or programme of study will be charged the appropriate fee for the unit or programme for continuing students and those who will have overstay on the programme.
(7) Students repeating course units or programmes where the fee structure has been revised upwards will be charged the revised rates.
(8) Every student admitted to a programme of study of Makerere University shall be required to sign an undertaking regarding fees payment.

The University experienced Student unrest following the pronouncement to implement the Fees Policy. This was followed by a directive by Government to halt the implementation of the Policy and carryout comprehensive stakeholder consultation. The University undertook a rigorous stakeholder consultative exercise and passed the mutually acceptable Fees Policy in July 2016.

6.4 STUDENT POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

According to the records of the Academic Registrar at the University, the Student enrolment in the academic year 2015/16 was 39,546 students, 17,533 (44%) female; and 2,599 graduate students. Table 6.4.1 shows the total enrollment per College between 2008/2009 and 2015/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1,527</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,611</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>5,461</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>6,635</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>6,863</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td>5,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>4,132</td>
<td>4,374</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>4,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>6,956</td>
<td>7,321</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>7,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>3,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>2,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>8,023</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>7,736</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>9,984</td>
<td>8,891</td>
<td>9,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Portal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinja</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34,850</td>
<td>33,112</td>
<td>33,470</td>
<td>37,137</td>
<td>41,122</td>
<td>42,508</td>
<td>38,866</td>
<td>39,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>3,524</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female(Graduate)</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>32,570</td>
<td>31,607</td>
<td>31,794</td>
<td>34,806</td>
<td>38,323</td>
<td>38,984</td>
<td>36,376</td>
<td>36,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female(Undergraduate)</td>
<td>14,592</td>
<td>14,116</td>
<td>14,135</td>
<td>15,825</td>
<td>16,933</td>
<td>17,291</td>
<td>16,237</td>
<td>16,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Academic Registrar Student Roll

It can be observed from the above data that the total enrollment has been on an upward trend for most of the years. A summary of Students’ admission trends by country between 2003 and 2015 is provided in Table 6.4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ugandans</th>
<th>Kenyans</th>
<th>Tanzanians</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>International Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15,914</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16,431</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17,301</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>18,372</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16,522</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>18,007</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16,522</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18,222</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19,162</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20,823</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17,328</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19,034</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18,915</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20,155</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22,240</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22,867</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24,060</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>24,538</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24,618</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>25,308</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23,558</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>24,084</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23,441</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>23,867</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>21,707</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notable is the modest and declining percentage of international students admitted. The cause of this merits further investigation. Among the Public Universities, Makerere University shares 53% of the Student enrollment. The current distribution of Students among various disciplines is as indicated in Figure 6.4.1:
It is observed in Figure 6.4.1 and in Table 6.4.3 that majority of students are enrolled in the Social Sciences, Business and Education disciplines.
Table 6.4.3: Gender Distribution of Students in Disciplines at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>5,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>2,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences and Mathematics</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>4,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioural Sciences</td>
<td>6,613</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>11,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>13,86</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>2,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>4,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine and Health Sciences</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>2,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data shows a spike for Social Sciences and Humanities, which indicates that this discipline has rather too many students in comparison with the other disciplines. Further, there are more female students enrolled in the Social Sciences, Business and Education disciplines than in the STEM disciplines. The University Staff to Student ratio as of January 2017 was one staff to 26 students. The chart in Figure 6.4.3 and Table 6.4.4 show the number of graduates in the period 2012-2016, classified by gender.

Figure 6.4.2: Gender Distribution of Students in Disciplines, 2016
Figure 6.4.3: Graduands of Makerere University: Number and Gender (2012 – 2016)

Table 6.4.4: Number of Makerere University Graduates (2012 – 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation January 2012</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>11,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation January 2013</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>6,340</td>
<td>11,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation January 2014</td>
<td>6,341</td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>12,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation January 2015</td>
<td>6,613</td>
<td>6,742</td>
<td>13,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation January 2016</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>13,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data indicates that over time the gap between the number of male and female Students who graduate has been decreasing. On the other hand, the total number of graduands for both genders has a positive trend.

6.5 STUDENT HEADCOUNT

The Visitation Committee undertook a student headcount to establish the accuracy of the reported numbers and identify ghosts if any. The following is a summary of the findings from this exercise.

(1) The University Management presented for verification Student nominal rolls containing a total of 46,128 Students, categorized as: continuing, newly admitted and graduate Students. A total of 29,889 Students appeared for the headcount exercise, as of February, 2017 and were physically verified. This left a total of 16,239 Students who did not turn up for the verification despite appearing on the nominal roll of the University. Tables 6.5.1(a), (b), and (c) provide summaries of this information;

Table 6.5.1 (a): Summary of Students Presented and those Counted per Student Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Category</th>
<th>Number of Students on Nominal Roll</th>
<th>Number of Students Physically Counted</th>
<th>Number not Counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUING</td>
<td>30,306</td>
<td>21,027</td>
<td>9,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWLY Admitted</td>
<td>11,636</td>
<td>7,782</td>
<td>3,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>46,128</td>
<td>29,889</td>
<td>16,239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

(2) By the time of compilation of this Report (April 2017), the University Management had not provided reasons why the Students in question had not appeared for the
headcount. There is a risk that some of these Students may not actually be genuine Students of the University.

Table 6.5.1 (b): Summary of Students Presented and those Counted per College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Total No. of Students Submitted (a)</th>
<th>No. Counted Students (b)</th>
<th>Not Counted (c=a-b)</th>
<th>Absence Explained by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>6,760</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>3,123</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JINJA CAMPUS</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT PORTAL COMPUS</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>46,128</td>
<td>29,889</td>
<td>16,239</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

(3) In converse, it was also noted that a total of 4,235 Students turned up for verification during the headcount exercise but were not on the University Nominal roll. On further inquiry, the University Management categorized these Students as presented in Table 6.5.1 (c).

Table 6.5.1 (c): Summary of Students Counted per College not on the Nominal Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
<th>Not on Register but Counted</th>
<th>Acknowledged as known by Management</th>
<th>Disowned by Management</th>
<th>Unaccounted for by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jinja Campus</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fort Portal Campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>4,235</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

(4) The above analysis points to the fact that the University did not have an accurate nominal roll for its Students. Additionally, there is need to follow up the remaining 99
Students disowned by the University, as well as the 2,774, who had University identity cards and admission letters, yet the University did not know of their existence.

6.6 ANALYSIS OF CAUSES OF DISCONTENT AMONG STUDENTS AT MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

6.6.1 Background

Consistent with the mandate of the Visitation Committee, 2016 and the subsequent problem statement that clearly pointed out that the Students’ strike was the climax of the recent upheavals at Makerere University, particularly given the little attention that was placed on Students’ issues by the previous Visitation Committees, the Committee, 2016 undertook to identify the genesis of Students’ discontent that had culminated into the recurrent strikes at Makerere University with a view to informing strategic policy changes for successful public institution management. Specifically, the Committee prescribed the engagement of the University Students on their level of satisfaction and associated feedback analysis with respect to the following:

(1) To establish key stakeholders in the management of Students’ affairs through a stakeholder mapping exercise;
(2) To establish Students’ satisfaction levels with the academic programmes with respect to scope, teaching (content/depth) quality and relevance;
(3) To establish Students’ level of satisfaction with respect to: management of examinations at the University; compliance of examination scope with respect to taught subject matter; access to examinations as a right; efficiency of marking and results administration;
(4) To establish Students’ level of satisfaction with the welfare amenities such as: accommodation, food, health, general sanitation and sports; and
(5) To establish key strike triggers / causes among students of Makerere University.

6.6.2 Approach

The stakeholder analysis was employed as an initial impetus of the engagement on the students’ issues. The stakeholders who were identified for the exercise included the top executive, administrative and academic officers of the University as well as the Students’ Guild. The information obtained at this level of inquiry became the basis for the design of the students’ online tool which was successfully pretested prior to its administration. The sample size was scientifically determined using the Krejcie & Morgan (1970) formula. The tool was successfully administered to 795 volunteering Students (418 males and 317 females). The views presented in this section are those of the 795 volunteers and may not necessarily reflect the position of the entire Student population at Makerere University during the study.

The issues raised were quantified and aggregated for interpretation in line with the objectives of the exercise. The resultant findings were validated through a focus group interface with the Students’ Guild leadership while the feedback on the Students’ position synchronized through interface with the top administration and academic leadership. Analytical tools were employed to establish the top causes of discontent through comparator measures based on weighted averages and ratios.

Finally, the survey data was applied to a Stakeholder Analysis Matrix to capture the logic of interest, power, impact and influence of the different stakeholders in the context of Student affairs at Makerere University.
6.6.3 Causes of Student Discontent as Perceived by Key Stakeholders

The results of the initial stakeholders’ mapping exercise that involved top executives, administrative and academic officers of the University identified the following top six causes of Student discontent ranked by cardinal importance as perceived by the respondent stakeholders (also refer to Figure 6.6.4):

1. Policy formulation process and dissemination methods,
2. Policy rejection e.g. fees policy and charges,
3. Delayed results
4. Missing marks,
5. Poor general sanitation, particularly, filthy lavatories, and
6. Poor food quality.

Amongst these, the outstanding cause of recurrent Student discontent from the viewpoint of the University top managers and Student leadership were categorized as follows:

1. Governance issues: the manner of formulation and dissemination of university policies e.g. policies concerning fees and other charges.
2. Academic concerns: Examination and Results Management;

However, it was noted that outside the above priority concerns, commonly cited issues pertaining to academic delivery systems did not register among the primary causes of discontent within the institution. Likewise, frequently media overhyped external factors such as political meddling into the University affairs were also adjudged to have limited impact.

Figure 6.6.4: The Ranked Causes of Students’ Discontent as Perceived by Stakeholders

Source: Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

6.6.4 Responses of Representatives from the Students’ Body on Causes of Discontent

Table 6.6.4 shows the leading causes (50% and above) of Makerere University Students’ discontent based on a representative sample of the Students’ body members by gender. The Students’ perception on the key causes of discontent largely matched that of the wider stakeholder community in Figure 6.6.4, thereby firming up the stakeholder pronouncement on the lead causes of the discontent primarily emanating from governance (policy formulation and dissemination e.g. the policy on university fees and other charges; staff strikes that spill
over to the students), subsequently from academic concerns (missing and misplaced examination results and delayed release of examination results) and ultimately from welfare issues (poor sanitation/dirty toilets).

**Table 6.6.4: Perception of Causes of Discontent by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of Discontent</th>
<th>Percentage by Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Policies on university fees and charges</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Missing and misplaced examination results</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff strikes spilling over to students</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Delayed release of examination results</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor sanitation /dirty toilets</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Absenteeism of lecturers</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of food</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Delayed release of students' allowances</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Insufficiency of teaching facilities -space, furniture, materials</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Spillovers of university administration/management conflicts to students</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Poor/insufficient accommodation facilities</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sexual harassment of students by staff</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Security and safety to students/lack of perimeter wall</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Influence of external/national politics</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Guild and other student leadership politics</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Committee Primary Data, 2016/17

### 6.6.5 Perceived Triggers of Strikes by Students

The top trigger was consistent with the top cause of discontent among Students. Indeed, the issue of institutional policies especially on fees and charges and equally the formulation and dissemination of these policies needed more Students’ participation and dialogue. Next was the integrity of the management of examinations that was cutting across the gender divide, indicative of the indisputable significance of the examinations to all Students (also refer to Chapter Five, Subsection 5.4.7 of this Report). However, on further probing on the issue of fees policy it was noted that they were not opposed to the obtaining fees policy per se but were unhappy on how it was being implemented. Students were quite critical of the way the policy took every Student to be of the same economic background and did not provide avenues for those who had genuine financial hardships.

*Figure 6.6.5* shows the five leading triggers of Students themselves. Further analysis of the top five triggers corroborates earlier findings.
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The significance of examination access was further underscored by the fact that subsequent three triggers 2-4 of the strikes in Figure 6.6.5 were linked to examinations. It was further noted that the male students were likely to be more discontented by the University’s policies and access to welfare issues such as food. The missing and misplaced examination results, which ranked second in position, affected female students more than their male counterparts.  

6.6.6 Weighted Causes of Discontent

Figure 6.6.6 presents the top four causes of Student discontent. It is clear through the weighted analysis that the main cause was University policy on fees and charges and their formulation process, followed by a poor examination management system. It was observed that the process of formulation of the Policies on fees has caused student strikes the world over. This may imply lack of a consensus-driven approach of arriving at mutually acceptable policies with clear obligations for all parties.
This reinforced the challenges presented by female Students under *sexual harassment* during the Focus Group Discussion as revealed in Table 6.6.7.1, particularly *sex for marks* grievances that mirrored the difficult access to results by affected female students.

6.6.7 Focus Group Discussion

6.6.7.1 Interface with the Students’ Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger/ minority groups</th>
<th>Perceived Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Delayed/misplaced/ lost examination results | (1) Poor motivation among the lecturers. (poor/late salaries)  
(2) Unfair examination formats  
(3) Lecturer absenteeism  
(4) Staff heavy workloads  
(5) High teacher/student ratio  
(6) Lack of streamlined grievance management systems  
(7) Indiscipline among some lecturers and some lecturers not responding to the exam results policy |
| Sexual harassment (of female students mostly) | (1) Inadequate security and security lighting  
(2) Ignorance/naivety of some students  
(3) Intimidation/blackmail by lecturers  
(4) Poor enforcement of university policies  
(5) Provocative dress code by some female students  
(6) In some Colleges sex-for-marks was becoming a norm  
(7) Unprecedented punishment by lecturers such as confiscation of girls’ mobile phones or demanding that they present their course work at defined places in person.  
(8) Ambush of girls by boys through discussion groups |
| Absenteeism of lecturers | (1) Part-time lecturers miss classes a lot  
(2) Laziness/lack of morale among lecturers  
(3) Some lecturers are just arrogant/irresponsible  
(4) Some lecturers may be ill due to advanced age |
| Special presentation of students with disability | (1) Missing classes or tests due to lack of/poor access facilities to lecture rooms and halls of residence. (E.g. Library, science, medical school)  
(2) Examination time is not adapted to level of disability.  
(3) The blind Students are not allowed to use braille in exams, instead they have to use guides – yet they use braille for lectures.  
(4) Some lecturers are not helpful and others are even rude and insensitive to the students with disability  
(5) University delays to release funding to the disabled (deaf and blind) to pay their guides –leading to misunderstandings with guides  
(6) Student guild does not facilitate all students with different disabilities as they are expected. |

*Table 6.6.7.1* provides the Students’ leadership survey responses on the factors that trigger strikes at the University. These responses complement the causes that had been analysed earlier but went further to explain the perceived underlying causes for the respective trigger.
The respondents under trigger (a) advanced a number of perceived causes for lecturers’ poor delivery ranging from low motivation, poor facilitation, and heavy workload to virtual indiscipline. Under trigger (b) the Students affirmed that sexual harassment was rampant on Campus, and this was either self-inflicted or undesired; the proposals for the status quo range from poor security, intimidation, poor enforcement of University regulations to personal accountability of the victims. Under trigger (c) the blame was on part-time Lecturers, indiscipline of teaching staff, arrogance and ill healthy/age. Under trigger (d) responses from Students with special needs revealed insensitivity of the University Administration inclusive infrastructure, in addition to insensitivity of policy and staff.

6.6.7.2 Interface with the Managers of Students’ Affairs

The Visitation Committee interacted with the University Managers of Student Affairs in a post-survey session. The findings are summarized in Table 6.6.7.2.

Table 6.6.7.2: Results of the Post-Survey with the Management of Students’ Affairs (the University Wardens)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Perceived Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Issues</td>
<td>1) The Wardens observed that welfare for Students in the Halls of Residence is inadequate and offered explanations for some of shortcomings in their work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Experiencing challenges with Service Providers because the contracts/MoUs that they had signed with them were not implemented as agreed. E.g. payment schedules were not followed by administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) The money allowed for feeding a Student per day (about UGX 4,000/- Ug. Shillings.) was too little for the Caterers to provide a balanced/adequate diet for Students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Some of the Services Providers were incompetent/ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Toilets were not kept clean because the number of Cleaners was too small to cater for the large Student numbers using the facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Breakdown of Internet services in Halls of Residence (including Kabanyolo Hostel) created a source of discontent to the Students as they could not do their work online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) The Students experienced delays in payments of some of their allowances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses by the University Wardens in Table 6.6.7.2 on the triggers of Students’ strikes point to causes which could only be well understood and articulated by managers in their administrative positions. The responses underpinned the underlying causes of poor delivery of welfare services to Students in the Halls of Residence. The Wardens attributed the woes to the inadequate Government subventions for Students’ welfare that affected the contracted services notwithstanding the fact that catering services had been divested to the private sector in keeping with the recommendations by McGregor (2007).

The Committee observed that the Student welfare managers especially the Wardens were stressed just like the Students themselves due to the pressures that had been brought to bear on them while trying to resolve the mismatch between inadequate subventions on unit welfare costs versus growing Student expectations amidst rising costs. Understandably, the collective voice of the Wardens was in favour of outsourcing the Students’ welfare management services which may not be tenable under the prevailing funding policies.

6.6.7.3 Interface with the Academic Leadership

The Visitation Committee interacted with the Academic Leadership of the University in a post-survey session. The findings are summarized in Table 6.6.7.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Perceived Causes</th>
<th>Respondents’ Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Delayed release of examination results + Missing and Misplaced results** | **Student related challenges:**  
- Impersonation: Knowing their academic weakness that could lead to failure of the examination, some students deliberately put wrong registration numbers/wrong names on exam booklets to avoid detection.  
- Staff related challenges. Inefficient management of examinations  
- Laxity of some Heads of Department.  
- Poor communication about timelines e.g no defined timetable when to start and end marking.  
- Lack of induction of new lecturers and other administrative staff.  
- Units not staffed adequately. Some offices of Heads of Department do not have a secretary. | Invest more in the exam exercise – hire people to invigilate/supervise exams to weed out this vice.  
Recruit more support staff.  
Enforce central marking.  
Hire people to mark to keep timelines and to avoid delays/missing marks.  
Establish a tracking system of Graduate theses. |
| **Discontented or unhappy /overloaded staff** | Use of part-timers who are not paid on time.  
Low staffing levels/understaffing. Most departments are operating at 44-48%  
Discontented staff due to delayed salaries/allowances /incentives – leading to slow release of marks.  
Failure/delay in regularizing staff contracts.  
Unrealistic timeframes  
Inadequate teaching facilities for both graduates and under graduates. Units’ usually first handle under graduates and graduate exams and results delay.  
With big numbers of students, marking takes longer. This is more pronounced among senior staff members like professors who are too busy with research.  
**Poor record keeping/management:**  
Manual system of record keeping delays release of results.  
Lack of data segregating students from different units’ leads to errors and delay.  
Data entry by different people at the Schools level leads to variation in data entered.  
Current results management system does not capture retakes these come back as missing marks. | Pay staff timely what due to them to keep them motivated.  
Recruit more academic staff to improve teacher/student ratio. |
| **Policy absence/poor implementation of existing policy:** | Failure to comply/enforce policies at different levels.  
Lack of implementation of the university policy of central marking. | Student registration should not be tagged to payment of fees.  
Colleges should be given autonomy to handle student’s conflicts, recruit, manage and discipline them.  
Each lecturer should account... |
The university calendar affected by late reporting by students too much time taken by Bazaars at the beginning of the semester. Lack of robust policy on release of results. Lack of policy on entering results on Results Management System. Poor coordination in the Intra units – servicing units leads to students results getting misplaced/lost. E.g. CHUSS services Education, COBAMS, CONAS, it is difficult to account for all the students involved. for their students – enter results on the system and leave hard copies with the Head of Department. All leadership positions in the university should be gazette with salary scales – not leadership allowances. Operationalize performance appraisal for lecturers.

| Staff Strikes Spilling over to students | Staff strikes target crucial times in the semester e.g. exams period. Students join in because they are directly affected by absence of lecturers. Indecisiveness of top leadership of the university. | Address problems that lead to staff strikes. Constant engagement of leadership with staff and other stakeholders |
| Poor quality of food | Feeding is now centralized at about 4,000 shillings per student per day- this is not realistic, considering current prices, Money is taken to a central pool and payments to service providers take too long. | Pay the money directly to students. |

Table 6.6.7.3 summarizes the Committee’s interface with the Academic Leadership. The Academic Staff acknowledged most issues raised by Students and further explained a number of issues including systematic failures affecting their own welfare. The Academic and Administrative Staff were indeed knowledgeable on the causes of Student strikes and were largely in agreement with the Students’ position with exception of denied missing or misplaced examinations by Academic Staff. On this issue particularly, it was pointed out that it was a two-way process; i.e. there were Student-related challenges and staff-related challenges under the allegations over missing/misplaced marks. They therefore advanced that the Students’ position of apportioning blame on Staff was dishonest. Particularly since some of Students’ actions often led to the misplacement through poor coding of their examination papers. There were a number of cases whereby Students upon knowing that they were likely to fail a particular paper, and consequently had to pay for the failed paper, in addition to the agony of retaking it, would enter wrong examination numbers to hide their identity.

### 6.7 ASSESSMENT OF ADEQUACY OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The Visitation Committee assessed adequacy of Students’ support systems at Makerere University. The findings are presented below.

#### 6.7.1 Level of Satisfaction with the Way Students’ Strikes have been Handled

The Committee assessed Students’ satisfaction with the way Students’ strikes were management. The findings are summarized in Figure 6.7.1(a).
Figure 6.7.1 (a): Students’ Perception on how the MaK Students’ Strikes have been Resolved

Figure 6.7.1(a) shows Students’ perception with respect to the handling/resolution of strikes to date. The low propensity for the Students to internally resolve discontent is indicative of poor grievance management capacity at the Students’ Guild level; while the higher involvement of Government and state machinery is indicative of weaknesses at the University governance level, which points to the hitherto observed shortfalls in policies critical to the Students’ agenda. In Figure 6.7.1 (B), the Committee presents Students’ proposals on how strikes could be managed better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive from government/ministry/parliament etc</td>
<td>0.633962264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions by university administration</td>
<td>0.608805031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police intervention</td>
<td>0.491823899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students called off the strike</td>
<td>0.290566038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal arbitration</td>
<td>0.191194969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.059119497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.7.1 (b): Proposed Ways for Handling Students’ Strikes

As illustrated in Figure 6.7.1 (b) the most preferred option was through timely communication between Administration and Students. This showed an overwhelming desire...
for improved communication channels in order to enable better dialogue between the University administration and the Students’ Guild. The proposition points in the positive direction because it is indicative of strike fatigue on the Students’ side that is apparently driving the ardent desire for dialogue at the Guild level so as to weed out obtaining internal inefficiency. The Committee further explored Students’ attitude towards strikes as a means of communicating discontent. The findings are presented in Figure 6.7.1 (c).

![Figure 6.7.1 (c): Students’ Attitude towards Use of Strikes as a Means of Communicating Discontent](image)

The Students’ attitude on strikes presented in Figure 6.7.1 (c) above shows overwhelmingly the existence of a poor grievance management system at the University. Precisely, Students did not feel that they are heard or listened to so they drift into violent mode in order to attract attention or to avoid sanction. The Students are apparently averse to the Police intervention as this was the least scored among the proposed interventions. The Committee also explored Students’ satisfaction with the delivery and relevance of course to the job market. The findings are presented in Figure 6.7.2.
6.7.2 Assessment of Adequacy of Academic Delivery Systems

![Bar Chart: Students' Satisfaction with Course Relevance to the Job Market and Examination Process](chart)

Figure 6.7.2 shows the level of Students’ satisfaction with respect to channels of delivery of academic content, relevance, competence and examination processes at Makerere University by gender. Whereas the delivery systems and content are generally satisfactory, the examination process was scored low (<50%) and especially by the female students. The worst scored was the marking and timely release of examination results. This is consistent with the issue of managers of examinations holding female students captive against sexual favours during the focus group discussion. Students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the welfare amenities at the University. The findings are summarized in Figure 6.7.3.
6.7.3 Assessment of Adequacy of Students’ Welfare System

Figure 6.7.3(a) presents the level of students’ satisfaction with welfare amenities. Students rate the services as generally low with only power supply being rated above 50% (refer to sample photographs in Figure 6.7.3 (b)). The female students are especially affected by water supply and entertainment services. The quality and quantity of food and sanitation status in Halls of Residence caused the least satisfaction at 25%, this notwithstanding efforts at implementing the McGregor (2007) recommendations. Nevertheless, on further inquiry it appeared that given the importance of diet to students, welfare and study there was always underlying tendency to go on strike on other issues, but triggered by poor feeding and sanitation.
Leaking floor in Mitchell Hall

Figure 6.7.3 (b): The Committee Members visited the Halls of Residence
6.7.4 Satisfaction with Offices Handling Student Affairs

The Committee investigated Students’ level of satisfaction with the management of student affairs. The results are presented in Figure 6.7.4

Figure 6.7.4: The Level of Satisfaction with Offices Handling Student Matters

Figure 6.7.4 shows the perceived level of satisfaction with the way Student affairs were being handled. It is noteworthy that the level of satisfaction with the University offices handling Student affairs were generally low. The University offices in charge of Students’ welfare from the Dean of Students to the Vice Chancellor’s office scores were the lowest (i.e. <50%). This was particularly regrettable for the Dean of Students and Wardens and the Academic Registrar who were regarded as the front-liners for Student affairs. The Academic Officers at College level; namely the Heads of Departments and Principals were more satisfactory than the DVC Academics and Academic Registrars’ offices. This further underscores the better performance of the University Academic Management System over and above the welfare (Office of Dean of Students) and the Examination Management System (Academic Registrar’s Office). On Students’ leadership, the School and Student leadership were generally satisfactory but the Guild President and Guild Council were rated below standard. The latter called for a holistic review of the Students’ Management Policy with a view of decentralizing some of the critical functions to Colleges. Indirectly the approval is also an indirect score on the Students’ appreciation of decentralization versus centralization of critical operations in the University including policy implementation and academic management, especially with respect to examinations.
6.8 RECOMMENDATIONS ON STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES

6.8.1 The University should:

(1) Explain and justify the actual existence of the 16,239 students, who were not verified during the headcount (due to their absence/non-existence).

(2) Investigate why 4,235 students who had documentation did not appear on the nominal rolls.

(3) Create a platform for engaging Students, Parents/Guardians and University management.

(4) Strengthen the Grievance Management System for Students.

(5) Improve the identification system for Students, Staff and Visitors to facilitate legitimate use of University resources and enhance Campus security.

(6) Establish a list of accredited Students’ Hostels reviewed annually.

(7) Streamline Student Guild Structures to affirmatively include Graduate Students.

(8) Develop and implement strategies for Students to engage in philanthropic activities and community services.

(9) Review the Fees policy to provide for a case-by-case payment plan for Students with genuine financial challenges.

(10) Explore partnership with Internet Service Providers to improve the Wi-Fi experiences all over the Main Campus.

(11) Facilitate the Student Guild to operate the on-Campus kiosks, secretarial bureaus, beauty and wellness parlours (saloons), among other commercial units targeting Students as clients, as income generating streams to support Guild Programs.

6.8.2 Government should fast track the plans to rehabilitate all Halls of Residence.
CHAPTER SEVEN: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Sound Financial Management is at the heart of a well-governed University. Finances drive all University processes alongside the effective deployment of competent motivated employees. The Visitation Committee as part of its terms of reference was tasked to conduct a special audit of the financial management practices at the University. The Auditor General of Uganda was a member of the Visitation Committee. He chaired the Finance Sub-Committee and accordingly presided over the special audit which was conducted in conformity with the International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions (ISSAIs), International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) and in accordance with the Forensic Investigations and Special Audit Guide 2014. Under article 163 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995 (as amended) the Auditor General is mandated to audit and report on the public accounts of Uganda and on all public offices. Under section 13 of the National Audit Act, 2008, the President, Parliament or the Minister may at any time request the Auditor General to conduct a special audit and to make a special audit report. Additionally section 22 of the National Audit Act 2008, mandates the Auditor General to undertake any special Audit or Investigation deemed necessary.

In accordance with Section 26 of the Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions Act (2001) as amended, His Excellency the President appointed a Visitation Committee to review the affairs of Makerere University. As a member of this Visitation Committee, the Auditor General was specifically requested to;

(1) Conduct a special audit into the Financial management practices of the University and if necessary conduct a forensic audit; and

(2) Conduct an audit on the population of the Students, Teaching and Non-teaching Staff studying or working at Makerere University.

Accordingly, the Auditor General undertook a special audit of the University’s operations covering the three year period from 1st July 2013 to 30 June 2016 and in cases where need arose the scope was extended to earlier and later periods. This Chapter of the report contains the findings and recommendations made as a result of the special audit that was undertaken whose tasks were more specifically defined as detailed below:-

(1) To establish whether the funds appropriated were utilised in accordance with the prescribed laws and regulations;

(2) To evaluate the existence and effectiveness of internal controls;

(3) To evaluate the budget performance of the University;

(4) To establish completeness and accuracy of revenue disclosed;

(5) To establish whether all funds were utilised with due attention to economy, efficiency and effectiveness;

(6) To identify areas of potential fraud for further investigations, if any;

(7) To establish the level of development of the University in regard to finances, research, teaching, and infrastructure;

(8) To assess the University’s investment management with a view of evaluating whether investments serve the University’s objectives; and

(9) To establish staff and student numbers with a view of identifying ghosts.
The Audit was limited to examining and analysing the documentation and information provided during the course of the audit.

7.2 Makerere University FUNDING TRENDS

7.2.1 Government Funding

The University receives Government funds by way of subvention mainly to finance Staff salary payment, Student welfare and development projects. Over the years under review, Government has released all the funds budgeted as subvention, as shown in the Table 7.2.1-1 below.

Table 7.2.1-1: Trend in Government Funding over a period of Three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>MTEF Ceilings – UGX</th>
<th>Budget – UGX</th>
<th>Releases – UGX</th>
<th>Shortfall in Release – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>79,570,000,000</td>
<td>81,500,000,000</td>
<td>81,504,693,489</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>95,300,000,000</td>
<td>89,180,000,000</td>
<td>89,180,150,472</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>115,060,000,000</td>
<td>115,060,000,000</td>
<td>115,056,452,014</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.2.1: Graph showing Trend of Government Funding over the last Three Years

7.2.1.1 Utilisation of Government Funds

On average, 65% of Government funding was used to finance Staff-related costs of salaries and pension, 12% was used to finance Government-sponsored Students’ welfare at a rate of UGX.708,500 per Student per semester and 22% was transferred to the Presidential Initiative for STI Projects at Makerere University, as summarised below:

Table 7.2.1-2: Utilisation of Government Funding over a Three Year Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>44,850,869,250</td>
<td>49,335,956,171</td>
<td>72,482,973,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent Costs</td>
<td>14,894,487,617</td>
<td>17,561,855,520</td>
<td>19,834,377,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Presidential Initiative Projects</td>
<td>21,600,335,622</td>
<td>22,123,338,584</td>
<td>22,580,099,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Development of the University</td>
<td>159,001,000</td>
<td>159,000,197</td>
<td>159,001,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81,504,693,489</td>
<td>89,180,150,472</td>
<td>115,056,452,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sharp increase in the salaries figure in the financial year 2015/2016 was as a result of the marked increment in the basic salary pay for the University Staff. From the above table, Government support for the development of the University stands at only UGX.159 million annually. This amount has remained constant for the last 3 years despite increasing requirements at the University.

Recurrent costs are used to finance Government-sponsored Students’ welfare and other overhead costs like: teaching materials, internet costs, examination, recess, internship and administrative expenses. The Government-sponsored Students’ welfare is budgeted at UGX.708, 750 per Student in a given semester, broken down as follows:

Table 7.2.1-3: Breakdown of Government Sponsored Students’ Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Unit Cost – UGX</th>
<th>Amount – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>4.25 months</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>127,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Water and Electricity</td>
<td>4.25 months</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>21,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>84 days</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>119 days</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>708,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audit noted that the rate of Students’ welfare of UGX.708, 750 per Student per semester remained constant for the three years under review. The Team was not able to establish when this amount is to be reviewed. Given the increase in the cost of living, this amount may not be realistic.

Table 7.2.1-4: Analysis of Recurrent Expenditure Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds available for Recurrent costs</td>
<td>14,894,487,617</td>
<td>17,561,855,520</td>
<td>19,834,377,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilised as follows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Food</td>
<td>1,904,000,000</td>
<td>6,280,456,000</td>
<td>5,280,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,303,643,350</td>
<td>2,500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>717,955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving out Allowance</td>
<td>1,862,000,000</td>
<td>1,862,000,000</td>
<td>1,862,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>2,121,109,042</td>
<td>1,654,543,250</td>
<td>1,654,543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>4,200,000,000</td>
<td>3,200,000,000</td>
<td>1,614,797,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention to Infectious Disease Institute</td>
<td>1,600,000,000</td>
<td>1,600,000,000</td>
<td>1,600,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Bandwidth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>542,357,400</td>
<td>542,357,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security contribution</td>
<td>3,920,530,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,254,098,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,841,639,587</td>
<td>16,443,000,000</td>
<td>22,026,207,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>3,052,848,030</td>
<td>1,118,855,520</td>
<td>-2,191,829,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above analysis, Government funding for recurrent costs improved over the last three years. However, the increment was taken up by the social security costs which rose in tandem with the salary increment in 2015/2016. As a result, the actual expenditure was beyond the funds available in 2015/2016, thus leading to a deficit of UGX.2.19 billion, which contributed to the buildup of domestic arrears.

### 7.2.2 Internally Generated Funds

Apart from Government contribution, the University generates funds from other various sources. The funds are retained by the University and spent as Appropriation in Aid (AIA). Below is a breakdown of the funds generated by the University over the 3 years as reported in the University financial statements:
Table 7.2.2-1: Breakdown of Internally Generated Funds per Financial Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F/Y</th>
<th>No of Students (Registered)</th>
<th>Budgeted Amounts – UGX</th>
<th>Amounts Collected – UGX</th>
<th>Shortfall in Revenue – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>42,508</td>
<td>122,590,439,007</td>
<td>103,076,996,162</td>
<td>19,513,442,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>38,586</td>
<td>126,503,940,411</td>
<td>99,137,915,082</td>
<td>27,366,025,329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 7.2.2: Graph showing a Trend of Internally Generated Funds

From the table and graph above, there was a steady drop in Internally Generated Funds (IGFs) over the three years and a persistent shortfall in revenue collection. Management partly attributed this to a drop in Student numbers. Although the Student numbers slightly increased, by over 1,000 students, in FY2015/16, both the budgeted and actual revenue figures in the year did not recognise the increment in Student numbers.

7.2.2.1 Utilisation of Internally Generated Funds

The funds released by Government to meet salary expenditure are not adequate. The bulk of internally generated funds is used to finance staff related costs, such as salaries, allowances and pension. Accordingly, the University uses part of its internally generated funds to co-fund salaries, social security costs and pay for the incentive allowances, as summarised below:

Table 7.2.2-2: Showing Utilisation of Internally Generated Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Available</td>
<td>103,076,996,162</td>
<td>99,137,915,082</td>
<td>94,938,757,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent as Follows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>86,734,250,275</td>
<td>66,058,954,473</td>
<td>55,881,996,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2,027,409,415</td>
<td>2,527,407,634</td>
<td>6,299,725,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Related Costs</td>
<td>17,117,067,918</td>
<td>21,143,375,909</td>
<td>25,680,464,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overheads</td>
<td>6,904,199,470</td>
<td>4,560,034,660</td>
<td>4,107,460,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112,782,927,078</td>
<td>94,289,772,676</td>
<td>91,969,647,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, the bulk of IGFs was utilised to meet Staff costs; however, in 2015/2016 this figure drastically reduced because of increased government support to pay Staff salaries, as depicted in Table 7.2.2-2 above.

7.3 **FINANCIAL PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS**

7.3.1 **Non-Adherence to the Approved Budgeting System**

The University adopted an Activity Based Budgeting System in which revenue and expenditure are estimated based on activities to be undertaken. Major activities that drive costs are identified and expected levels of activity are used to determine the amounts to be included in the budget. From the foregoing, involvement of administrative units from the onset is imperative for such a system to be successful.

On the contrary, it was noted that involvement of lower units in the University budgeting process was minimal and at times just a formality. Most administrative units did not prepare budgets based on their levels of activities. They prepared budgets that were not balanced or had budgets that were not approved by the respective Finance Committees. In some instances, the final budget outcome had no semblance with the initial input from administrative units. The audit also noted that sometimes key activities whose cost drivers were at the unit level were budgeted for at the Centre; key among them were internship allowances and examination costs.

Under the current arrangement, budget estimates were generated by the Finance Department and then allocated to administrative units using a base which was not related to the actual levels of their activities. This has an effect of skewing the budget from the Activity based system. As a result, excessive budget adjustments are made during budget implementation, sometimes leading to mischarge of expenditure.

**Recommendation**

The University should ensure proper implementation of its Activity Based Budgeting system as a tool for creating realistic budgets with emphasis on a bottom-up approach, which creates competition for resources and ensures prioritisation of activities.

7.3.2 **Lack of Budget Lines for Major Expenditure Items**

The audit noted that the University had major spending areas which did not have separate budget lines in the University Chart of Accounts. Key among them was student feeding, teaching materials, scholarships and student allowances. These key expenditure lines were all put together under the budget item of scholarships and related costs. This makes budget monitoring and performance measurement difficult. Failure to track such huge expenditure lines may lead to budget abuse as funds meant for these activities can easily be diverted to other activities without detection.

**Recommendation**

The University Management is advised to consider adjusting the existing Chart of Account (COA) to cater for all major expenditure lines to enable tracking of such expenditures at a more granular level.

7.3.3 **Weak Budget Adjustment Controls**

A budget reallocation is a change in the approved budget which does not alter the total sum of the amounts in the original budget. On the other hand, a budget revision is a change to the approved budget, which usually results in a significant change in the total amount in the original budget.
The audit noted that the guidance in the University Finance Manual on re-allocations and other budget adjustments was not detailed. The Manual did not provide for justification, documentation and approval of budget adjustments.

The lack of details in the provisions of the Manual notwithstanding, the auditor noted that the University’s Finance Department carried out budget re-allocations and revisions authorised unilaterally by the Bursar without evidence of proper authorisation. In addition, after budget adjustments, unit work-plans were not adjusted to reflect the budget revisions. Such a practice has the attendant risk of abuse.

Also noted was that the frequency of budget adjustments was so high, indicating lack of prudent and realistic estimates at the initiation stage.

Recommendation

The University should provide more guidance regarding budget adjustments and ensure that proper authorisation is obtained from appropriate authority. In addition, there is need for the University to improve her forecasting practices so as to have realistic budget estimates.

7.3.4 Weak Commitment Control System

The commitment control system is used to compare any approved expenditure amount against available budget to avoid overspending on budget lines and incurring domestic arrears. The University uses the Ledger works system for processing payments and this system has a commitment control provision. However, the commitment checking system available on the Ledger works accounting system was not effectively used and was circumvented with ease. This resulted into budget overrides and sometimes accumulation of domestic arrears. Table 7.3.4 shows a summary of the over expenditures during the period under review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budgeted – UGX</th>
<th>Actual – UGX</th>
<th>Variance – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>71,966,032,923</td>
<td>78,556,495,689</td>
<td>-6,590,462,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>3,572,185,837</td>
<td>3,846,385,965</td>
<td>-274,200,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The failure to adhere to the commitment control system was attributed to the poor system configuration which allows transactions to be posted directly to the ledger even when they do not pass the budget control test check, thereby bypassing the control. The audit also noted a system weakness whereby the commitment control functionality can be enabled and disabled by a super user to allow creation of a purchase order where there is no budget. This has the attendant risk of abuse.

Recommendation

Given the several weaknesses in the Ledger works system, the University should consider adopting a more robust financial management system including, but not limited to the Integrated Financial Management System of Government, which enables the institution to comply with budgetary controls.

7.3.5 Completeness of the Budget

The audit noted that the University did not compile a comprehensive budget for all her activities in any given financial year. For example;

(1) estimates of incomes and expenditures for most of the University’s projects and short courses run at College level were not included in consolidated budget of the University.
(2) Budgets for payables were way too low compared to what was eventually paid, a case in point was the financial year 2014/15 where UGX.780m was budgeted, but UGX.2.2bn was paid out.

(3) Key activities such as recess term activities were not included in the budgets. Under the circumstances, the budgets did not reflect the true picture of the activities of the University. The failure to compile a complete budget may culminate into diversion of funds, irregular budget adjustments, buildup of arrears and skewed budget performance.

Recommendation
The University should review her policy on budgeting and expenditure authorisation to ensure that all University revenue and expenditure are included from all levels of the Institution.

7.3.6 Failure to Undertake Budget Monitoring
The purpose of budget monitoring is to ensure that resources are used for their planned purposes and properly accounted for. Monitoring ensures that there is value for money, and timely corrective actions are taken for any significant deviation.

Despite the known benefits, the University did not have a well-laid down system for budget monitoring, and as such no budget monitoring reports were prepared for possible action by Management. In addition, the responsibility of the vote controllers was not formally assigned to Heads of Department.

These weaknesses have contributed to budget abuses such as spending beyond budget, mischarge of expenditure, committing beyond budget resulting into domestic arrears, non-implementation of planned activities and spending on unbudgeted items.

Recommendation
The University should devise a comprehensive budget monitoring mechanism that will enable timely follow up action.

7.3.7 Expenditure Irregularly Posted to Codes that have No Budget Provisions
A review of the University cashbooks revealed instances in which expenditure was posted to codes which had no budget provision. For example, during the financial year 2013/2014, expenditure amounting to UGX.2.8bn was posted to liability codes of 415003, 415006, and 418002 while UGX.13, 822, 327 was posted to a reserve account code 511201.

Posting expenditure on item lines that have no budget is a circumvention of the budget controls and renders the whole budgeting process ineffective. It further portrays a weakness on the part of Staff charged with the responsibility of ensuring that activities are implemented according to the budget provisions.

Recommendations
(1) The Accounting Officer and the Head of Accounts should ensure that payments are only approved under budget lines which have budget provisions.

(2) These anomalies merit further investigation.

7.3.8 Unspent Balances Carried forward at the End of the Year not considered in Future Budgets
The Committee noted that at the end of each financial year, various University accounts had unspent funds that were carried forward to the subsequent financial years. However, the audit
was not provided with any evidence that such funds would be included in the subsequent budgets. For example, an analysis of the University accounts and financial statements showed that over the years under review, a total of UGX.48,292,938,921 was rolled over to subsequent years as shown in Table 7.3.8 below:

**Table 7.3.8: Cash Balances Carried forward each Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Cash Book Balances – UGX</th>
<th>Audit Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>9,451,741,947</td>
<td>93% of funds on expenditure accounts. 7% on project accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>19,792,172,134</td>
<td>88% of the funds are held on expenditure accounts. 12% are on project accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>19,049,024,840</td>
<td>67% on expenditure accounts, 30% on project and 3% on collection accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48,292,938,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these funds accounted for tangible outputs for the financial years in which they were utilised, there were no budget revisions to cater for utilisation of such funds. To this end, there was a mismatch between outputs and the funds available for spending in any financial year. The failure to include carried forward balances in the budgets exposes such funds to a risk of abuse and diversion from approved activities.

The audit further noted that although the University had unspent funds at closure of each financial year, it remained with unpaid bills which would have been paid using such funds, to reduce on the University indebtedness. This therefore puts into question, the University’s treasury management practices.

**Recommendations**

1. The University should review her budgeting policy to have all un-utilised and uncommitted funds at the end of the year, included in the subsequent year’s budget and approvals obtained from Council on how to utilise such funds.

2. This should be further investigated.

**7.3.9 Other Weaknesses Identified in the Budgeting Manual**

The Budget Manual is meant to be a comprehensive guide for all budget related procedures and actions. A review of the guidance on budgeting contained in the manual revealed the following weaknesses;

1. The duty and responsibility for setting internal ceilings was not defined in the Manual. Management explained that the ceilings are set by the Planning Unit; however, this duty was not formally provided for in the Manual.

2. The Manual did not specify in sufficient detail how budgeting for project funds and grants was to be consolidated into the main budget of the University. In addition, budgeting for benefits in kind (for example, grants in kind that lead to a cost saving), reporting on budgets for non-consolidating units such as investments and farms was not provided for.

3. Section 4.1.7 provides for transfers from the central contingencies budgets but the budget itself made no mention of contingencies budgets including how much was to be set aside for contingencies.

4. Cash inflows to the University were periodical, with the bulk of funds flowing in close to fees payment deadlines. University expenditures, on the other hand were spread evenly throughout the year. This mismatch of inflows and outflows made cash
flow planning a necessity. However, the Manual made no provision for a requirement of cash flow planning and budgeting.

(5) Although the Manual specified that the budget should be in line with the University’s Strategic Plan, it did not guide the user on how to link the budget with the Work-Plans and to the Strategic Plans/Framework so that they can each address the needs of the University. As a result, the work-plans prepared by the University did not specify the outputs and measures of how they would achieve the University’s Strategic Plan.

(6) A detailed budget cycle (Budget flow process) outlining timelines within which activities related to budgeting should take place was not provided for in the Manual. The deadlines for each activity, including specific and clear communication channels for all budget Centres was not included in the Manual.

(7) The Manual lacked remedies and administration actions to Staff who do not comply with the provisions of the Manual.

Recommendation

The University should review her Budgeting Manual with a view of addressing the above, and any other weaknesses identified.

7.4 REVENUE, GRANTS, PROCUREMENTS AND EXPENDITURE

7.4.1 University Revenue

7.4.1.1 Revenue Collection System

The University used three IT systems to manage the collection of revenue from Students. The process was semi-automated and the individual system functionalities are highlighted in Table 7.4.1-1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>System Functionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The Integrated Tertiary Software (ITS) system using the FINIS Module.</td>
<td>This manages Student’s transaction details like billing and student statements. A bill is created immediately a Student registers and once a payment is received, it automatically reduces the bill. A Student ledger is managed in this system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MAKPAY</td>
<td>Provides an interface between the Bank and FINIS module in the ITS system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ledger works</td>
<td>This is an accounting system used for financial reporting by the Finance Department of the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CEMAS</td>
<td>Was intended to handle Student records management and financial management; however, the system had challenges and was withdrawn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University used seven Banks for the collection of revenue from Students. Payment of mandatory fees required a Student to provide a Student number on the fees payment slip while other payments required a Student to provide either a name or a phone number to the Bank.

Once a payment was made, the Bank interfaced with the ITS system via MAKPAY and the Student’s financial statement/ledger was updated automatically. Students were not issued with exam permits before they had fully settled their bills to zero. The actual reporting of revenue was done in ledger works; where the total daily revenue received by the fees collection accounts in the respective Banks was manually entered into ledger works by the Finance Department Staff. This was because Ledger Works is not integrated with ITS and MAKPAY. Therefore, the information which was manually entered into Ledger Works formed the basis for generating revenue reports by the University.
The audit performed a walk-through test of the above systems and noted the following weaknesses:

1. Billing of a Student was only done upon registration; this implied that before a Student registered the system could not bill such a Student. It should be noted that registration of Students is done every semester for every Student; however, some Students either registered very late or did not register at all.

2. There was no reconciliation between the registered Students, paid up Students on the ITS and the Students who sat for exams. This implied that Students could sit for exams and get results without paying fees. Analysis of Students in the results management system and the ITS system revealed a total of 2,708 students who had results but were never billed at all, as shown in Table 7.4.1-2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. There was a lot of manual intervention on the ITS system which allowed posting of payments directly into Student accounts. This responsibility was open to several Staff and is likely to be a gateway for fraud through posting funds even where payments have not been made. Further, manual intervention on the ITS can lead to revenue leakages.

4. Funds paid by cheques or by electronic transfer did not bear the details of the Students, making it difficult to post such funds into the ITS system.

5. Recognition of revenue received was based on bank statements rather than student ledgers.

6. MAKPAY did not provide for automatic reconciliation with the ITS system.

7. The Banks were not strict on inclusion of Student numbers on every transaction making reconciliation with the ITS system impossible for transactions without unique identifiers.

8. The License for the ITS expired in 2008 and no upgrades or updates have been performed on the system since then.

9. The University Fees Payment Policy states that Students who default payment of fees or who are in debt to the University for any reason shall not be allowed to write their examinations, or proceed further with their studies, or receive a transcript, degree or any award; however, we noted several students who were examined and graduated yet they owed money to the University as shown in Table 7.4.1-3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE DURATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>AMOUNT – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>21,720,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>159,334,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>4,067</td>
<td>3,500,972,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>485,457,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>4,167,486,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information regarding the status of amounts owed by the above Students was not availed to the auditors.

**Recommendations**

1. The University should consider undertaking a comprehensive review of her revenue collection processes including introduction of a single IT system to manage all such revenues and also be able to seamlessly interface with the other University systems.

2. The University should devise means to ensure that all un-collected revenue due from Students is collected.

### 7.4.1.2 Uncollected Revenue

Due to the weaknesses described above, audit could not place reliance on the revenue information presented by these systems; therefore, the following procedures were performed to determine the revenue that ought to be collected by the University:

1. Tuition fees and mandatory functional fees for all Undergraduate Students from all Colleges and remote campuses who were examined during the period under review were computed as stipulated in the University Fees Policy, special consideration was made for the Students under the biological scheme who pay 50% of tuition.

2. Tuition fees and mandatory functional fees for all Graduate Students who registered for the period under review was re-calculated based on the Fees Policy.

3. Expected fees from the various categories of retakes was computed, the categories considered were; retakes by continuing Students, stay-put retakes, and out of University retakes.

4. Expected fees from the affiliate institutions including Makerere University Business School was recomputed using their registered Students.

5. Other fees like graduation fees, application fees, PUJAB fees, Entry exam fees (Diploma Entry, Mature entry scheme and pre-entry exam fees for Law and MBA) were recomputed using Student numbers who applied.

6. Accommodation fees for private resident Students was computed based on the standard bed numbers available in the halls of residence after excluding those taken up by Government.

7. Deductions were made for the reported Student debtors and unremitted fees from affiliate institutions.

8. Consideration was given for Students who paid but were either not examined or had no results on the system.

9. Graduation fees were recomputed based the number of Students who graduated each year.

Having considered all the above, Table 7.4.1-4 below shows a summary of the computed and expected revenue in the period under review;
Table 7.4.1-4: Summary of the Internally Generated Revenue that ought to have been collected from the Core Mandate Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and functional fees</td>
<td>86,008,185,490</td>
<td>84,918,399,490</td>
<td>77,028,889,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate fees</td>
<td>1,318,767,500</td>
<td>1,287,237,500</td>
<td>1,739,642,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation fees</td>
<td>1,269,070,000</td>
<td>1,396,470,000</td>
<td>1,578,230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid students with no results on the results</td>
<td>8,661,803,606</td>
<td>5,536,951,380</td>
<td>6,021,879,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fees</td>
<td>1,400,750,000</td>
<td>1,288,250,000</td>
<td>1,294,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUJAB</td>
<td>2,214,732,000</td>
<td>2,085,720,000</td>
<td>1,991,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retakes’ fees</td>
<td>568,400,000</td>
<td>872,180,000</td>
<td>642,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Entry exams</td>
<td>310,590,000</td>
<td>264,860,000</td>
<td>329,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Accommodation</td>
<td>969,120,000</td>
<td>1,636,560,000</td>
<td>1,475,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>103,285,672,714</td>
<td>99,286,628,370</td>
<td>92,101,703,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98,260,740,597</td>
<td>94,572,421,099</td>
<td>87,985,895,470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the audit compared the amount of expected revenue with the amount of reported internally generated revenue in the financial statements and noted a discrepancy of UGX.5,251,891,185 billion over the 3 years as indicated in Table 7.4.1-5 below:

Table 7.4.1-5: Comparison of Expected Collection with what was Collected and Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expected collection – UGX</th>
<th>Amounts reported in FS - UGX</th>
<th>Uncollected Revenue - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>98,797,551,287</td>
<td>96,887,951,829</td>
<td>1,909,599,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>93,904,874,006</td>
<td>92,305,331,082</td>
<td>1,599,542,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>88,180,180,902</td>
<td>86,437,432,099</td>
<td>1,742,748,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>280,882,606,195</td>
<td>275,630,715,010</td>
<td>5,251,891,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is apparent that there was revenue leakage within the system. Funds that ought to have been collected were not collected. The above scenario is attributed to the several weaknesses existing within the revenue collection system which have been taken advantage of, by both Staff and Students to avoid payment of fees. Further, comparison of the amounts received in the Banks with the amount reported in the financial statements indicated a discrepancy of UGX.4,209,331,396 as indicated in Table 7.4.1-6 below:

Table 7.4.1-6: Comparison of the Amount Reflected in the Bank with Amount Reported in the Financial Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amounts on Bank Statements - UGX</th>
<th>Amounts Reported in FS - UGX</th>
<th>Variance - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>94,283,022,959</td>
<td>96,887,951,829</td>
<td>-2,604,928,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>91,757,480,120</td>
<td>92,305,331,082</td>
<td>-547,850,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>85,380,880,535</td>
<td>86,437,432,099</td>
<td>-1,056,551,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271,421,383,614</td>
<td>275,630,715,010</td>
<td>-4,209,331,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in the above table indicate that not all the reported revenue was actually received and banked intact as per the guidelines on revenue collection.

Recommendations

(1) The University Management should explain the causes of revenue leakages.

(2) All revenues owing to the University should be collected.
(3) The responsible officers should be further investigated.

7.4.1.3 Miscellaneous Revenue Analysis

The University collected miscellaneous revenue from several sources which included; Staff rental houses (both senior and junior staff houses), Hire of space (usually Canteens and Banks), Short courses (offered at Colleges), Bazaars, Electricity and Water (consumed at Staff houses), Interest from donor bank deposits, Lease of land, Hire of vehicles, Translations, among others. Collection of this revenue was made at the revenue collection account at the Centre, and used to be spent at source until 2015/2016. After 2015/2016, miscellaneous revenue was collected on a central account and distributed in line with the budget. Table 7.4.1-7 below shows the reported miscellaneous revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Amount Reported – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>6,189,044,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>6,832,584,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>6,992,332,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audit noted that the potential for revenue from miscellaneous sources was not fully harnessed, with huge unexplained fluctuations from year to year as shown in Table 7.4.1-8 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reported 2013/14 (UGX)</th>
<th>Reported 2014/15 (UGX)</th>
<th>Variances (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff accommodation/ furniture</td>
<td>340,316,845</td>
<td>734,763,329</td>
<td>53.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire of space</td>
<td>748,401,815</td>
<td>390,738,800</td>
<td>-91.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project overheads</td>
<td>8,635,888</td>
<td>223,841,262</td>
<td>96.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA interest received</td>
<td>1,137,476,898</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Charges</td>
<td>58,371,293</td>
<td>6,174,000</td>
<td>-845.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>35,747,933</td>
<td>132,598,985</td>
<td>73.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>506,246,633</td>
<td>40,728,647</td>
<td>-1142.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

(1) The University Management is advised to strengthen her miscellaneous revenue estimation and collection procedures/guidelines in order to plug the potential leakages therein.

(2) Management should set clear targets at the start of the year for each miscellaneous revenue source

(3) Management should centralise its collection, in the event that it is deemed to provide a better collection method.

7.4.2 Grants to the University

7.4.2.1 Stock of University Grants

The University has a Grants Management Office mandated to track and provide information regarding grants. Upon request, this Office provided a list of 184 active grants with total revenue of UGX.32 billion in the financial year 2015/2016. However, circularisation and interaction with the individual Colleges revealed that a total of 246 grants existed with total revenue of UGX.135, 810, 585, 793 in 2015/2016. Table 7.4.2-1 below shows the distribution of the active grants over a period of three years:
Table 7.4.2-1: Stock of Grants per College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Unit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF LAW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRGT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the Grants Management Office is not effective and the records held by them are inaccurate and incomplete.

7.4.2.2 Absence of a Grant Management Policy

A research grant management policy provides high level guidance regarding proposal development, approval, financial and personnel management and, ethical and regulatory compliance. This is accompanied by a detailed hand book which specifies the rules, procedures and guidelines within which projects arising from grants are supposed to operate.

Currently, projects/grants management within the University is highlighted in two documents: The Finance Manual and the Research and Innovations policy. The provisions of the Finance Manual are generic and limited to how funds will be received and accounted for. It is however silent about the other aspects of financial management such as grant financial reporting. The manual also has no mention of the non-financial aspects, such as personnel management and grant acceptance.

It is critical to note that the University assumes liability and risk on behalf of all research projects undertaken, therefore having a well laid down policy and guidelines are crucial to both the University and the funders. In the absence of a policy and standard operating procedures to guide the operations of grants/projects, proper implementation is dependent on the integrity of the Principal Investigators who source for the funding.

Failure to streamline the budgeting, expenditure and reporting aspects of the grants within the main University systems, exposes the University to several risks. These may include but not limited to: duplication of efforts, abuse of resources, noncompliance with donor requirements, ethical and regulatory violations, and exposure to litigation, loss of donor goodwill and a tainted reputation. As result of a weak grants management office and absence of grants management policy and manual, several other weaknesses were noted;

7.4.2.3 Failure to contribute to University Overheads

Research projects funded by external grants utilised University resources from inception to completion. Such projects were expected to contribute to recurrent costs of the University and to capital expenditure to improve or at least maintain such facilities in good working condition. Accordingly, Paragraph 4.4.3 of the Makerere University Research and Innovations Policy, 2008, requires all research projects to contribute 15% of the grants as institutional overheads/indirect costs.
However, a review of the agreements/MoUs signed between the funders and the University revealed that most grants did not provide for this contribution and where it was done, it was less than the stipulated 15%. Worse still, even where it was provided for, no such funds were sent to the Centre. This is partly attributed to failure to include the University management in the negotiations of the terms and conditions of the grants.

The continued failure to support the University overheads constrains the University recurrent budgets of items like utilities and internet costs, and also provides no helping hand to the depreciation of the University infrastructure.

**Recommendations**

1. The University management is advised to strengthen the enforcement of the policy going forward, to ensure that all projects contribute to overhead costs at the Centre.

2. Such funding should be properly budgeted for and outputs identified with the involvement of Principal Investigators at all levels.

**7.4.2.4 Weak Grant Acceptance Process**

There was no evidence that the University had a documented process for sourcing and acceptance of grants. Currently, funding opportunities are identified by Staff as individuals or teams, who write proposals and compete for funds. Once the proposal is accepted, consultations and negotiations are done between the Principal Investigator (or the College depending on the sensitivity and amounts involved) and the donor.

The audit noted that under the current arrangement, the first point of University management involvement was with the review of the draft agreement by the Legal Department, which was done for some of the grants. It was also noted that in some instances, agreements/MoUs between the University and the funding agencies were signed by College Principals, Deans, Principal Investigators (PIs) and Heads of Departments (HoDs). This is in direct contravention of the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions Act, which mandates only the Vice Chancellor and the University Secretary to sign a binding agreement on behalf of the University.

The effort and initiative by individuals who source for such grants should be appreciated; however, the current arrangement allowed individuals to unilaterally source for funds and enter agreements without involvement of the University Management. This not only exposes such funds to risk of abuse but also exposes the University to reputational risk and litigation in case of failure to comply with the terms stated in the agreements.

**Recommendation**

The University should strengthen the enforcement of her policy regarding acceptance of grants, to ensure protection of her interests and minimise exposure to risk of abuse.

**7.4.2.5 Exclusion of Grants’ Revenue and Expenditure in the Financial Reports of the University**

Revenue from grants was quite significant and in some years, it surpassed the internally generated revenues of the entire University budget. In the period under review, the University received a total of UGX.346Bn from grants alone. Despite the magnitude of these funds, these were not included in the University budgeting, expenditure and reporting systems. Table 7.4.2-2 below shows a comparison between the total annual grants revenue and that which was reported in the University’s annual financial statements over the period under review:
Table 7.4.2-2: Revenue from Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Grants Received (UGX)-Equivalent</th>
<th>Grants Reported in the Financial Statements – UGX</th>
<th>Grants Excluded in the University Financial Statements – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>95,898,997,848</td>
<td>8,653,627,830</td>
<td>87,245,370,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>114,442,458,638</td>
<td>10,983,905,581</td>
<td>103,458,553,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>135,810,585,793</td>
<td>6,454,200,588</td>
<td>129,356,385,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>346,152,042,279</td>
<td>26,091,733,999</td>
<td>320,060,308,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The BoU average rates for the Fys were used for conversion of foreign currency figures to UGX.

Exclusion of such amounts from the University systems may result into duplication of efforts, failure to maximize outputs from the available resources and misleading financial reports, since the stakeholders are not availed a complete picture of the University’s financial resources. Further noted was that there was no agreed computerised accounting system for managing grants revenue and expenditure with each College using a different package. In the extreme case, the College of Computing and Information Science was maintaining purely manual records in this regard. This limits the efficiency of grants management and constrains transparency of grants activities.

Recommendations

1. The University Management should include all grants revenues and expenditures in her budgeting, expenditure and reporting systems; including compilation of a comprehensive set of financial statements, disclosing all the revenues and expenditures from all grants managed by the University.

2. Management should consider implementing the same accounting system for all grants to enable proper record keeping and monitoring of all project revenues and expenditures.

7.4.2.6 Expenditure of Grant Funds

Review of the grant expenditure at a global level revealed that most grant funds are used to finance research-related activities and personnel costs of project staff. For example, an analysis of the project expenditure for the College of Health Sciences for the financial years 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 indicated the percentage of grants spent as summarised in Table 7.3.2-3 below:

Table 7.4.2-3: Summary of Expenditure for College Health Sciences Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>2014/15 (USD)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2015/16 (USD)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Human Resources</td>
<td>9,711,681.49</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9,643,045.04</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Related</td>
<td>9,388,464.50</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12,222,481.00</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Grants</td>
<td>3,330,375.71</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,391,646.22</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Workshops</td>
<td>2,484,894.86</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,579,105.11</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Transport</td>
<td>1,810,025.26</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,685,129.42</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and Trainee related</td>
<td>1,102,910.45</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>707,478.80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses and Other expenses</td>
<td>955,374.03</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>800,699.22</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Equipment</td>
<td>243,424.96</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>568,051.84</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>416,852.44</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,246,076.81</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,444,003.70</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32,843,713.46</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that research related costs are mainly made up of field allowances, consultation costs, fuel, vehicle hire, field guides, and data entry.
7.4.2.7 Unaudited grants

All grants made to the University form part of public funds of Uganda, which in accordance with the Constitution, are required to be audited by the Auditor General. It was however noted that over the years, the majority of the projects/grants have not prepared financial statements and submitted them for audit as summarised in Table 7.4.2-4 below:

Table 7.4.2-4: Unaudited Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Number of Active Grants</th>
<th>Number of Grants Audited by OAG</th>
<th>Number of Grants not Audited by OAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was further noted that even the University’s Internal Audit Department did not review the books of account for majority of the grants. This denies users of the financial statements the much-needed assurance that funds are being put to their intended use.

**Recommendation**

All grant funds should be subjected to both internal and external audit scrutiny and the modalities of undertaking this should be incorporated in the Grants Management Policy.

7.4.2.8 Excessive cash withdrawals

Cash is inherently risky and cash withdrawals should be minimised to avoid the high risks related to cash. From a sample of projects reviewed, it was noted that there was excessive withdrawals of cash from the Grants bank accounts as summarised in Table 7.4.2-5 below:

Table 7.4.2-5: Summary of Cash Withdrawals from Project Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Total Cash withdrawals</th>
<th>% age Withdrawn as cash</th>
<th>Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU SPH GBP</td>
<td>155,790.80</td>
<td>92,984.50</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>GBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITM- UGX</td>
<td>1,414,214,765.00</td>
<td>647,777,336.00</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>UGX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research UGX</td>
<td>38,639,924,941.82</td>
<td>16,852,128,682.00</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>UGX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research USD</td>
<td>16,341,649.67</td>
<td>4,449,735.07</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARVMAC</td>
<td>2,580,405.28</td>
<td>581,029.07</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITM ACCOUNT</td>
<td>634,763.53</td>
<td>128,317.00</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>EURO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

(1) Withdrawal of cash should be limited to avoid the risks that are associated with such a practice.

(2) Measures should be put in place to limit the use of cash transactions in the execution of grants.

(3) The National Council for Higher Education should institute regulations for performance management for research projects.

7.4.3 Bank Accounts

7.4.3.1 Accounts Disclosed by Management

The University confirmed running a total of 230 Bank Accounts of which 15 were reserved for Revenue Collection, 102 were Expenditure Accounts and 113 were Project Accounts. The number of Bank Accounts appeared to be too high with an account opened for every Unit and Project. This creates book keeping challenges. During the audit, the audit circularised the Banks to confirm the completeness of the above list. However, a total of 12 Bank Accounts
disclosed as Makerere University Accounts by Banks were neither disclosed to the Auditor nor known to Management. The details of these 12 Bank Accounts are highlighted in Table 7.4.3-1:

Table 7.4.3-1: List of Bank Accounts not known to the University Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>Curr.</th>
<th>Balance as at 30th June 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0105610648900</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MUIENR GEF DANIDA WILDLIFE PROJECT</td>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>3,957,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105610665100</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>THE DARWIN ACCOUNT MUIENR</td>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>4,781,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105612047300</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MU-REG. CTR FOR QUAL. HEALTH C, MU-RCQHC/REDSO</td>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105613539900</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MUK IENR-CONTRAST</td>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>533,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705610648900</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MUIENR GEF</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>321.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705610678200</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>THE ADMINSTRATOR MEDACT STUDY DEPT OF PAEDIATRICS M.U.K</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705610713200</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>THE CHAIRMAN M.U.K FACULTY MEDIC COMP SYS</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>1,649.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705611837400</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>THE UNIVERSITY BURSAR MAKERERE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>1,581.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705612715800</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>THE DIRECTOR MAKERERE UNIVERSITY MRCI</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705612794400</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MUK MARGARET TROWELL SCHOOL- OF INDUSTRIAL &amp; FINE ARTS</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8705613465100</td>
<td>Standard Chartered</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY-NOMA PROJECT</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4912300001</td>
<td>Centenary Bank</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL</td>
<td>UGX</td>
<td>846,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existence of such accounts unknown to the University Management is a recipe for perpetuation of fraud.

Recommendations

(1) The Inspector General of Government (IGG) should investigate these accounts and establish the details of how they were opened up and the individuals operating them for purposes of bringing them to book.

(2) Management should undertake a comprehensive review of its Bank Accounts with a view of identifying any such accounts that could be closed or combined, to attain efficiency and economy.

7.3.4.2 Dormant Bank Accounts

Review of the activity on a number of accounts revealed instances of inactivity ranging from six (6) months to two (2) years on 24 Accounts. It should be noted that such dormant Accounts are also prone to abuse and fraud. Spending such long periods without a transaction is an indicator that such accounts may no longer be necessary. The details on Dormant Bank Accounts are provided in Table 7.4.3-2;
Table 7.4.3-2: Dormant Bank Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>341319889</td>
<td>MAK AGRIC MSI BANANA PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6002905645</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY AGRIC BIO INNOVATE CASSAVA/SWEET POTATOES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6002463502</td>
<td>AGRA MSC TRAINING PROGRAM IN PLANT BREED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6002901941</td>
<td>DANIDA BANANA PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6002982178</td>
<td>BIO INNOVATE SORGHUM AND MILLET PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6003410402</td>
<td>MUK BIO INNOVATE 06/2011 ACCOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barclays</td>
<td>6003566658</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DFCU</td>
<td>02083551831054</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY SUCCEED-EDULINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DFCU</td>
<td>02083500584524</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY AGR/A SOIL HEALTH PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td>0080266102157001</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY FEES COLLECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Post Bank</td>
<td>1630037000075</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY OPERA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stanbic</td>
<td>9030005904462</td>
<td>M.U-NEWCASTLE DISEASE VAC. PJT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Stanbic</td>
<td>9030006074889</td>
<td>POSTGRADUATE HALL SCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>0105613400000</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY /INNVOKAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>0105613993903</td>
<td>MAKERERE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>0105612778101</td>
<td>M.U.K DEPT OF POL.SC &amp; PUB.ADM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>105610648900</td>
<td>MUIENR GEF, DANIDA WILDLIFE PROJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>105610665100</td>
<td>THE DARWIN ACCOUNT MUIENR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>105612047300</td>
<td>MU-REG. CTR FOR QUAL. HEALTH C, MU-RCQHC/REDSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>105613539900</td>
<td>MUK IENR-CONTRAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>8705610648900</td>
<td>MUIENR GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>8705610678200</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATOR MEDACT STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>8705610713200</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN FACULTY MEDIC COMP SVS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Standard Chartered Bank</td>
<td>8705611837400</td>
<td>THE UNIVERSITY BURSAR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

(1) The University Management should investigate and establish the status of these Accounts with a view of confirming their authenticity and closure where applicable.

(2) Management should periodically review the activity on its Bank Accounts with a view of closing any accounts that become dormant.

7.4.4 Procurements

The University follows the Public Procurement and Disposal Act of 2003, as amended in 2014 and the attendant regulations, guidelines and best practice notes issued by the PPDA. The audit conducted a review of the procurement function at the University to ascertain its readiness in addressing her needs and establish the level of compliance of the procurement systems with the provisions as laid down by the statute, regulations, guidelines and best practices. The review revealed instances of non-compliance, circumvention of some controls and instances of fraudulent practices. Many of these led to financial losses; some of which
audit teams could quantify with a reasonable degree of accuracy, while others could not be quantified due to certain limitations. The summary of the observations are explained in the subsequent paragraphs.

7.4.4.1 Financial Losses due to Procurement Irregularities

From a sample of procurements reviewed, the audit team noted that the University could have incurred a financial loss of UGX.807,028,275 in the period under review resulting from procurement and contract management irregularities. The irregularities included:

1. Specification of brands in the bid documents for particular supplies contrary to Regulation 28 of the PPDA 2014;
2. Unfair disqualification of the lowest bidders by the evaluation Committees;
3. Making payments at inappropriate exchange rates, contrary to the special conditions of contracts; and
4. Failure to deduct liquidated damages as required by the contract terms.

The details of the individual procurements are shown in Appendices to the Audit Report of the Committee.

7.4.4.2 Fraudulent Procurement Practices

Section 3 of the PPDA Act, 2003 defines fraudulent practice as “a misrepresentation of facts in order to influence procurement or disposal process or the execution of a contract to the detriment of the procuring or disposing entity...” A review of a sample of procurements worth UGX.14,814,374,551 undertaken during the period revealed instances of fraudulent tendencies, which included:

1. Intentional understatement of the estimated value of the procurement to fit within a certain threshold, so as to influence the method of procurement. This led to use of inappropriate methods of procurement in a bid to limit competition and have particular suppliers invited to bid.
2. Use of inappropriate procurement methods without satisfactory justification so as to circumvent open competition.
3. Shortlisting a bidder who was involved in preparation of bills of quantities for the same procurement, which gives the bidder insider knowledge and unfair advantage over others.
4. Having the best evaluated bidders quoting the exact price stated in the procurement requisition by the user department, an indicator that they had access to information from the User Department, hence affecting the fairness of the competition.
5. Invitation and Evaluation of bids from firms that were not included on the shortlist approved by Contracts Committee contrary to Regulation 47(1b) of the PPDA rules.
7. Revising a bid price of the lowest bid by more than 80% without seeking clarification from the bidder and subsequently not communicating why the bid was rejected.
8. Companies which appear related on the face being allowed to compete against each other. Such companies were either sharing Directors, had the same addresses or TIN numbers. Such competition is pseudo as the companies share all information and determine who should win the bid.
Details of individual procurements are shown in the Special Audit Report.

7.4.4.3 Irregular use of the Direct Procurement Method and Failure to issue Solicitation Documents

Procurements totaling to UGX.936, 039, 974, as detailed in Appendix 3 and 4 of the Special Audit Report, were conducted without following the procurement procedures provided by the PPDA. The procurement procedures violated included:

1. There was no procurement requisition (PP Form 5) prepared and hence no approval by the Procurement Initiator and confirmation by the Accounting Officer of funding prior to the start of the procurement process.
2. There was no Contracts Committee’s approval of the procurement method, bidding document, shortlist and Evaluation Committee.
3. No formal invitation of firms to bid and therefore no solicitation documents were issued to the participating firms.
4. No evaluation was conducted and the selection of suppliers was not based on any particular criteria, which was inconsistent across procurements.
5. The Finance Committees of the User Departments’ performed the role of PDU and only submitted to PDU their recommended suppliers for approval of the Contracts Committee. The Contracts Committee members would singly approve the awards and only note the approvals on their following sittings. This practice is contrary to the principles of procurement as it affects transparency and accountability. It also exposes the University to a risk of awarding contracts to non-responsive bidders and at noncompetitive prices.

7.4.4.4 Non-Rotation of Bidders on Shortlists

It was observed that in a number of instances, the PDU invited the same companies on successive shortlists despite having a large pool of shortlisted suppliers. A case in point was the supply of ICT equipment for which the University has 62 firms on her shortlist but kept on inviting only 7 firms from which one of two companies would emerge the best evaluated. This not only contravenes the Procurement Regulations, but also deters competition and may be an indicator of collusion and bid rigging. Details are in Appendix 5 of the Special Audit Report.

7.4.4.5 Unacknowledged Invitations to Bid under Restrictive and Request for Quotations Methods

Regulation 43(1), Rules and methods of procurement, requires the invitation to tender under Request for Quotation method to be addressed to a sufficient number of bidders to ensure effective and real competition. It was observed that in many instances, the Procurement Unit invited many firms to bid but only one or two companies would respond with bids. Coupled with this, there was no evidence of issue of invitation letters to all shortlisted bidders as they did not acknowledge receipt of the notices. The Auditor did not obtain any evidence that the entity displayed the shortlists on the PDU notice board as required by Reg. 43(6). There were no copies of signed shortlist notices on procurement files.

During the special audit, several companies contacted confirmed that they were not invited to participate in the bidding process despite appearing on the list of invited bidders. This is an indication that the record of issue/sale of bids for the procurements could have been forged to appear as though there was genuine competition. Accordingly, for several procurements conducted, only one bidder responded to the process, which is contrary to Regulation 15(3).
that requires the entity to obtain at least three (3) bids under the quotations method. This in effect disadvantages the University as lack of competition leads to inflation of prices. Details are in Appendix 6 of the Special Audit Report.

7.4.4.6 Inclusion of Non-Prequalified Firms on Shortlist

In many instances, the University included non-prequalified firms on the shortlists for invited bidders and yet the University has a sufficient number of firms prequalified for various supplies, services and works. Although justification for inclusion of other firms outside the list was given as market knowledge and PPDA approved supplier, in principle, this would best work when there are no or insufficient numbers of prequalified firms for the particular service, or if there is justification for not allowing prequalified firms to participate in bidding processes. Details in Appendix 7 of the Special Audit Report. This renders the pre-qualification exercise worthless given that in most cases, the non-prequalified firms included on shortlists emerged the best evaluated bidders.

7.4.4.7 Failure to Conduct Market Survey

The PPDA Act, 2003 as amended, sets out basic procurement principles that require all procurements to be conducted in a manner which promotes economy, efficiency and achieves value for money. This would require the entity to carry out a market survey and maintain a list of reserve/market prices approved by the Contracts Committee to which comparison may be made when awarding tenders, and when estimating procurement. It was however observed that;

1. No market survey was conducted by the University for the period under review.
2. No assessment was done to ensure that the price quoted by the best-evaluated bidder does not exceed the prevailing market prices, as required by Regulation 5 of PPDA Regulations, 2014.
3. A number of procurements as detailed in Appendix 8 of the Special Audit Report were awarded at prices higher than their estimated values with some varying by as much as 400%. Different Units were procuring items of stationery at prices with wide margins. It was therefore difficult to ascertain if the goods, services, and works were obtained at reasonable prices that achieve value for money.
4. Incorrect price estimates led to the use of inappropriate methods of bidding.
5. Failure to use current price information could have resulted in the loss of public funds during the period.

7.4.4.8 Other Control Weaknesses

A number of control weaknesses and failures were identified and are detailed in Appendix 9 of the Special Audit Report, and summarised as here below:

1. User Departments did not support the estimated values of procurements with detailed bills of requirements, which in turn led to significant variances between the estimates and actuals, resulting in revision of scope of supplies at contract award stage.
2. The Evaluation Committees did not critically follow the criteria laid down in the bid documents. This may result into award of contracts to non-compliant firms.
3. The PDU did not maintain a register of contracts or contract management details to track the progress of contracts from time to time.
4. Procurements at Colleges were split to reduce the estimated value to fit within the threshold approved to be handled by the College sub-PDU (i.e. UGX.100, 000, 000).
This was common for ICT supplies, stationery, teaching materials and workshop materials.

In conclusion, the procurement function of the University was found weak; in many instances the User Departments had taken over the role of the Procurement and Disposal Unit without consequence. It is apparent that in many instances, procurement regulations were flouted, sometimes with intention of fraud.

**Recommendations**

1. The Accounting Officer has been advised to strengthen and closely monitor the activities of the Procurement and Disposal Unit, so as to ensure strict adherence with laid down procurement laws.

2. The IGG should investigate the procurement system of Makerere University with a view of bringing errant officers to book.

**7.5 UNIVERSITY PAYROLL MANAGEMENT**

The University staff are categorised into academic, administrative and support staff. These are paid from different payrolls which include: government payroll; incentive allowance payroll, contract staff payrolls and pension payroll. The following observations were noted:

**7.5.1 Payroll Processing and Management**

The University had no centralised system for managing all her payrolls. It was noted that whereas the HR Department would ordinarily be expected to manage all the payrolls, the Finance Department was responsible for the permanent Staff, pension and incentive payrolls. The contract Staff payrolls were managed within the different Units of the University.

Additionally, the various payrolls were maintained using different IT systems. The government payroll was maintained using the Integrated Personnel and Payroll System (IPPS), while the other payrolls were Manual.

Such a scenario exposes the University to a high risk of errors and fraud going undetected, which ultimately culminates into financial losses.

**7.5.2 Government Payroll**

This is the main payroll that caters for permanent Staff of the University. This payroll is co-funded by the University and Government of Uganda. These payrolls are generated through the Integrated Personnel and Payroll System (IPPS) which is hosted at Ministry of Public Service (MoPS). However, after decentralisation of the payroll by the MoPS, all changes to the payroll are currently initiated and implemented by University staff after approval by the Accounting Officer. The payrolls are then loaded onto the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS) for payment. The following additional observations were noted:

**7.5.2.1 Partial Contribution by Government**

Over the years from FY 2013/14 to FY 2015/16, Government’s contribution towards the Government payroll has been less than 100% as detailed in Table 7.5.2-1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Government Contribution – UGX</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>University Contribution – UGX</th>
<th>% age</th>
<th>Total – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>44,850,869,250</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14,800,000,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59,650,869,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>49,335,956,171</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14,900,000,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64,235,956,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>72,482,973,171</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22,650,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95,132,973,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>166,669,798,592</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52,350,000,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>219,019,798,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although Government was expected to have fully financed the Government pay roll, it was noted that the University continued to co-finance this expenditure item over the years with an annual average contribution of about 24%.

Management explained that there was a lot of effort made to ensure that Government takes over the University wage bill. For example, in a letter dated 30th July 2013, the Ministry of Education and Sports wrote to the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MOFPED) requesting it to take over the total wage bill of Makerere University and other Public Universities.

In addition, according to a letter dated 10th December 2014, the then Acting Vice Chancellor of Makerere University wrote to H.E. the President reminding him of the pledge he made to take over the wage bill of all Public Universities. This was after the University had received a Budget Circular from the MOFPED in which the budgetary ceiling did not reflect the pledge that H.E. the President had made. However, the audit team was not availed with responses from MOFPED in regard to the matter.

Recommendation

In view of the leakages, abuse and mismanagement, an independent task force should be put in place to establish the actual revenue and expenditure of Makerere University and advise Government on how to subsidise the University.

7.5.2.2 Staff Establishment

The approved Staff structure of the University of 2012 indicated a Staff establishment of 6,985. Basing on a review done in December 2016 by the Human Resource Directorate, it was noted that out of the total establishment, only 3,573 posts were filled leaving 3,412 vacant positions, translating into 51.2% of filled posts overall. A breakdown of Staff establishment is provided in Table 7.5.2-2 below:

Table 7.5.2-2: Summary of the University Staff establishment as per the review done by the HR Department in December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ESTABLISHMENT</th>
<th>FILLED</th>
<th>VACANT</th>
<th>%FILLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT STAFF</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC STAFF</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STAFF</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team further noted that these Staff were employed on different terms, such as: permanent, contract and part-time staff as follows:

Table 7.5.2-3: Summary of Categories of Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT STAFF</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC STAFF</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL STAFF</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staffing levels reveal serious gaps in the number of Staff employed by the University and this is likely to impact negatively on the quality of services rendered, especially in regard to the Academic Staff.

The audit further noted that the Support Staff constituted the majority of the approved Staff structure (49%) compared to Academic Staff (39%) and Administrative Staff (12%).
However, it should also be noted that the University has undergone some automation in a number of processes, outsourced some services, and eliminated inefficient business processes which should have leverage on the Staff gaps.

**Recommendations**

(1) The University should review her Staff structure given the passage of time since it was last reviewed (2012).

(2) Consideration should be given to changes in University requirements as dictated by certain parameters, such as: Student numbers, automation of a number of processes, outsourcing of services, elimination of inefficient business processes, and the available financial resources.

**7.5.2.3 Staff who left the University still on Payroll – UGX.256, 645, 692**

A total of UGX.256,645,692 was paid to individuals who had ceased to render services to the University for a number of reasons which included: resignation, death, retirement and dismissal. This was attributed to failure by the Finance Department to effect timely changes to the payroll as communicated by the Human Resources Department. Details are in Appendix 10 of the special audit report. Payments for salaries for no services rendered is a loss to the University.

**Recommendations**

The Accounting Officer should:

(1) promptly update the payroll to remove any Staff exiting the University.

(2) recover the amounts in question which could also be done from the terminal benefits that are to be paid to the concerned individuals.

**7.5.2.4 Overpayment of Salaries – UGX.107, 325, 999**

A review of the University payrolls revealed instances in which Staff were paid amounts over and above their entitlements, resulting into an overpayment of UGX.107, 325, 999. (Appendix 11 of the Special Audit Report refers). Such losses could be attributed to absence of proper reconciliation of payrolls with approved salary scales or even negligence on the part of the Staff who prepare the payrolls.

**Recommendation**

The University should recover all overpayments to Staff and institute a system of reconciling payrolls with the approved salary structures, before effecting payments.

**7.5.2.5 Staff that have Reached Retirement Age Still on Payroll – UGX.294, 361, 159**

According to Section 2.1(a) of the University Human Resource (HR) Manual, which became effective from 1st October 2009, appointment on permanent terms shall be the type of appointment where the period of service is up to the mandatory retirement age of 60 years. The HR Manual further stipulates that the University shall offer contracts of up to the age of 65 and 70 years, to Academic Staff at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor, respectively, in cases where their services are still needed by the University.

A review of the payrolls for permanent Staff revealed a number of Staff who were not part of the categories described above and had exceeded the mandatory age of 60 years, but were still active on the payroll. It should be noted that whereas some of these Staff had stayed on the payroll for less than a year, others have been on the payroll for more than three years.
As a result, the University irregularly paid a total of UGX.294, 361, 159 to such Staff who ought to have retired. In addition, the continued employment of such Staff has blocked employment opportunities to other citizens. Details are in Appendix 12 of the Special Audit Report.

Recommendation

The University Management should ensure that all Staff who have attained retirement age are deleted from the payroll and formal contract employment provided to only those identified after a critical needs assessment and review.

7.5.2.6 Salary Structure Inconsistencies

A review of the University payrolls revealed numerous inconsistencies in the salary structures, in which Staff were paid at inappropriate salary scales (above or below their entitlements).

As a result of the above, a total of 24 Staff were underpaid to a tune of UGX.247, 775, 235 (See Appendix 14 of the Special Audit Report), while 18 Staff were overpaid by UGX.8, 517, 185 (See Appendix 13 of the Special Audit Report). Such errors could be attributed to absence of proper reconciliation of payrolls with approved salary scales and can affect Staff morale and therefore productivity.

Recommendations

(1) The University Management should ensure that proper reconciliations should be carried out for all payrolls with the approved salary scales for Staff.

(2) The above errors should be followed up and payments or recoveries made accordingly.

7.5.2.7 Misleading/Inaccurate Staff Bio-Data on the Integrated Personnel and Payroll System (IPPS)

A review of data on the IPPS revealed several instances in which data on the system was inconsistent with the University Staff records. The inconsistencies existed in the Staff dates of birth, salary scales, and employment titles. For example; some Staff who holding Lecturer positions are indicated on the system as Stenographers. Refer to Tables 17.5.2-4 and 7.5.2-5 for details.

Table 7.5.2-4: Sample of Inconsistent Employee Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Employee Title</th>
<th>Confirmed Employee Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>841840</td>
<td>AKENA DICKENS</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841950</td>
<td>KIGUBA RONALD</td>
<td>Technician I</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869533</td>
<td>ONYAIT SIMON</td>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td>Clinician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840800</td>
<td>MUHWEZI WILSON</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Principal Assistant Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840800</td>
<td>MUHWEZI WILSON</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842088</td>
<td>MUSISI MOSES</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864462</td>
<td>SSEVVIRI AUGUSTINE</td>
<td>Technical Assistant</td>
<td>Senior Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841488</td>
<td>OLOBO JOSEPH</td>
<td>Waiters.Waitress</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841765</td>
<td>BWETE GERALDINE</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841957</td>
<td>KATUSHABE RUTH</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Copy Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864261</td>
<td>NASSUNA FLORENCE</td>
<td>Accounts Assistant</td>
<td>Clerical Officer (General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840233</td>
<td>KATO GODFREY</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Senior Clerical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840316</td>
<td>KATEREGA ROBINAH</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>Copy Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840624</td>
<td>HARRIET NAKANWAGI</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Copy Typist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840711</td>
<td>MBUYA PONTIANO</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Nutritionist Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.5.2-5: Sample of Inconsistent Dates of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Employee Title</th>
<th>Date of birth on the IPPS</th>
<th>Date of Birth by University</th>
<th>Difference (Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>840753</td>
<td>KISEKKA VINCENT</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>07/07/1954</td>
<td>07-Jul-78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840788</td>
<td>MALE MARGRET</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>15/07/1953</td>
<td>28-Dec-62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841042</td>
<td>NKalubo Benon</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>03/07/1954</td>
<td>01-Jan-60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>869152</td>
<td>OCANDA ALFRED</td>
<td>Laboratory Assistant</td>
<td>17/07/1948</td>
<td>18-Nov-78</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840659</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>17/07/1953</td>
<td>26/06/1953</td>
<td>11-Apr-70</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864999</td>
<td>Assistant accountant</td>
<td>07/07/1955</td>
<td>17/07/1948</td>
<td>29-May-59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840130</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>06/10/1953</td>
<td>07/07/1955</td>
<td>15-Feb-70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842099</td>
<td>Assistant accountant</td>
<td>04/12/1954</td>
<td>09/12/1952</td>
<td>22-Nov-65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840486</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>12/05/1954</td>
<td>04/10/1955</td>
<td>04-Oct-57</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864678</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>29/12/1953</td>
<td>22/05/1953</td>
<td>14-Feb-67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840369</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>04/12/1954</td>
<td>06/10/1953</td>
<td>10-Oct-58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840130</td>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>04/12/1952</td>
<td>15/07/1953</td>
<td>05-Feb-69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under such circumstances, the University is exposed to a number of risks ranging from delayed deletion of Staff who have attained mandatory retirement age, premature deletion of Staff culminating into legal challenges as well as illegal payment of staff.

**Recommendation**

The University should cleanup the Staff data held on the IPPS system in order to mitigate the risk of occurrence of the above outcomes.

7.5.3 Incentive Allowances Payroll

As a stop-gap measure, the University paid an incentive allowance as a top up to the salary of all permanent Staff using internally generated revenue. The payroll was compiled and maintained by the Finance Department using excel worksheets and payment was effected by sending schedules to a commercial bank. Examination of this payroll revealed the following observations:

7.5.3.1 Staff on Study Leave being Paid Incentive Allowance

The University Council in its emergency meeting held on 29th August 2013, resolved not to pay incentive allowance to Staff on study leave.

To the contrary, an analysis of the monthly incentive payrolls revealed that a total of UGX.813, 030, 372 was paid to Staff on study leave. It should be noted that application for study leave is not mandatory and is only done in instances where a member of Staff feels he/she will not be fully available to offer his/her services. Details are in Appendix 15 of Special Audit Report.

Under the circumstances, this amount was irregularly expended.
Recommendations

(1) All Staff incentives allowance irregularly paid should be recovered from beneficiaries.

(2) The University Secretary should ensure that Council decisions are adhered to and implemented accordingly.

7.5.4 Academic Staff with below Minimum Teaching Loads

Section 4 of the University's Human Resource Manual provides a minimum of 10 hours and a maximum of 12 hours a week as teaching load for Academic Staff. There are no guidelines for measurement of the hours outside the minimum teaching load.

Review of the Teaching Load Analysis Report for all Colleges for Semester I, Academic Year 2016/2017 from the Directorate of Human Resource, revealed instances of 471 permanent Academic Staff (excluding those with College administrative responsibilities and those on study leave) with less than 10 hours in a week with some having 0 (zero) teaching hours a week. Details in Appendix 17 of the Special Audit Report. This resulted into a loss of 2,116 hours in that semester which translates into an annual financial loss of UGX.3,597,200,000 paid to part-timers to cover the gap (at a rate of UGX.50,000 per hour).

It should be noted that the time that is not spent on teaching by Academic Staff, is not necessarily spent on research as audit noted that almost half of the research published by the University comes from two colleges, that is, College of Health Sciences (CHS) and College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (CAES). According to the University Annual Reports for the previous three years (2013, 2014 and 2015), the University had a total of 1,343 research publications, (journal papers, conference papers, monographs and book chapters) but 603 were from the two colleges of CHS and CAES. This leaves 740 publications shared by the remaining eight Colleges, with COCIS having 37 publications for the previous three years.

Teaching less than 10 hours a week with little research outputs for the majority of the Colleges implies that the University is not attaining full value for the money for salaries and allowances paid to some of her Academic Staff.

Recommendations

(1) The University should review and monitor all timetables to ensure that all Staff meet the minimum teaching hours. This should become part of the performance appraisal process.

(2) There should be a minimum requirement for every Academic Staff in term of research output. A system for measuring research outputs should be instituted and made part of the performance appraisal process to ensure that the University is not paying for no services rendered.

(3) Academic Staff who cannot attain the required research outputs due to constraints in financing should have their minimum teaching load revised upwards, so as to reduce expenditure on part time lecturers.

7.5.5 Contract Staff Payrolls

These payrolls cater for contract Staff of the University. Compilation and payment is scattered within the different Units of the University. Examination of these payrolls revealed the following audit observations;
7.5.5.1 Short Term Contracts for Non-Teaching Staff

The University employs 156 Non-teaching Staff on short contract basis in different positions as administrative assistants, technicians, records clerks, ID personnel, nurses, custodians, among other positions. It was noted that such Staff are offered very short contracts of between three to six months and some have been continuously renewed for the last 10 years. Details in Appendix 18 of the Special Audit Report.

The audit found that such three (3) months’ contracts very short, with a possible negative effect to the motivation of Staff due to the uncertainty surrounding renewal of contracts. In addition, this category of Staff does not benefit from incentive allowances and their salaries are always delayed by as many as four months.

The Head of the Human Resource Directorate explained that these Staff were recruited by the various Colleges as a stop-gap measure when Colleges were still allowed to recruit temporary staff every time there was a need. When recruitments were centralised to the Human Resource Directorate, the process of restructuring kicked off with an aim of phasing out and regularising some positions. The process of restructuring has never been completed due to a number of reasons. Therefore, the University keeps offering these Staff short-term contracts in anticipation of the restructuring process.

Recommendation

The restructuring process should be expedited to address this and other anomalies in the recruitment and retention of Staff.

7.5.6 Staff Housing

According to the Residential Housing Inventory Report of November 2016, the University had a total of 793 Housing Units of which 414 are occupied by Senior Staff and 379 are occupied by Junior Staff. A review of the housing records revealed the following observations:

7.5.6.1 Uncollected Housing Revenue

A total of 36 houses were occupied by former Staff who are currently not rendering services to the University due to retirement, resignation or death. Some of these individuals have occupied the houses for over five years from the time of their retirement/resignation/death. The University management explained that their continued occupancy of the Housing Units was due to the fact that the University had not yet cleared their terminal benefits amounting to UGX.636, 280, 046 and as such they could not leave the houses before their outstanding benefits could be paid (See Appendix 19 of the Special Audit Report for details of former staff involved).

It should be noted that their continued occupation of these houses does not automatically culminate into an offset of what is owed to them and the former staff are not paying rent. This could potentially lead to a financial loss of UGX.166, 931, 785 to the University in form of un-deducted rent over the years. Details in Appendix 19 of the Special Audit Report.

Recommendations

(1) The University should make an effort to pay the outstanding amounts owed to the former Staff in order to repossess the said houses.

(2) Management should recover the rent arrears when effecting the payments of the terminal benefits to the affected Staff.
7.5.6.2 Outdated Staff Housing Monthly Rates

The University offers houses to some of her Staff in areas like Makerere Hill, Katalemwa, Kololo and Bwaise. The Staff pay rent for these houses basing on the housing allowances provided for in the old salary structure. The University has not reviewed the rental rates for her Housing Units in a long time (since 2005/06), despite the several salary increments that have been implemented since then.

It was therefore observed that these rates are too low and do not take into consideration the fact that employee salaries have since been greatly enhanced. For example, employees on the M3 salary scale (scale for highest paid employees of the University) were being charged as little as UGX.274,286 per month for a three bedroomed house in Kololo, an upper-scale residential area of Kampala City. The average going market rates for such houses could be as high as UGX.2,000,000.

It should be further noted that the University can accommodate only 20% of her Staff, making this unfair for other Staff that stay much further, receive the same salary, but have to pay much higher for rent. With the current consolidated pay of UGX.11,415,184 for M1 Staff, the housing component could be revised to cater for this disparity. Currently the University is collecting only an average of UGX.500m from her 793 houses annually yet they have a potential to yield much more than that, especially if several of them are renovated.

Recommendation

The University Management should revisit the Housing Policy to reflect the current circumstances, especially the change in Staff remuneration and the current market rates.

7.5.7 Potential Financial Loss under Payrolls

As a result of the weaknesses in controls pertaining to management of the various payrolls, the University had incurred potential financial losses to a tune of UGX.5,077,080,407 during the period under review summarised as follows:

Table 7.5.7: Potential Financial loss incurred under Payrolls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Financial Irregularity</th>
<th>Amount (UGX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff who left the University still on Payroll</td>
<td>256,645,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overpayment of Salaries</td>
<td>107,325,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff that have reached retirement age still on Payroll</td>
<td>294,361,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Salary Structure inconsistencies</td>
<td>8,517,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Staff on study leave being paid Incentive Allowance</td>
<td>813,030,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Staff with below minimum teaching loads</td>
<td>3,597,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,077,080,407</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

The University should:

(1) recover the above amounts in several ways, including deductions from terminal benefits and/or salary payments to the concerned existing Staff.

(2) acquire a centralised human capital management system to improve efficiency in the management of matters pertaining to Staff right from recruitment to retirement.

7.6 MAKERERE UNIVERSITY EXPENDITURE

The University incurs expenditure under several categories of Staff costs, stationery, utilities, Student-related costs and minimal capital development. In addition to the observations under paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 regarding the University expenditures, the following observations were noted during the audit:
7.6.1 Irregular Payment of Honoraria

Section E-c of the Public Service Standing Orders paragraph 25 states that, “Honoraria is an allowance payable when Government wants a particular piece of work to be carried out by an officer within a specified period of time which:

1. Is of exceptional importance to Government;
2. Is outside the normal scope of the officer’s official duties;
3. Involves disproportionate amount of his or her official and private time;
4. Involves temporary additional responsibilities; and
5. Requires the direct use of the officer’s special talent or professional skill or his or her active participation in the actual work.”

Contrary to the above provisions, it was noted that a total of UGX.171,824,600 was paid as honoraria during the period, for executing duties considered to be within the normal scope of the officers’ duties. Refer to Appendix 20 of the Special Audit Report.

The audit team was not provided with satisfactory justification for the payments in question. The team therefore found such expenditure irregular.

Recommendations

The Accounting Officer should:-

1. ensure that payments in lieu of honoraria are made in accordance with the Regulations, and
2. initiate recovery measures of the amounts irregularly paid in this regard.

7.6.2 Payment of Arrears

Arrears arise when amounts due are not paid within the financial year in which they are incurred. During the audit, the team noted that payments amounting to UGX.309,407,538 as detailed in Appendix 21 of the Special Audit Report were in respect of invoices as well as commitments related to previous accounting period(s). It was noted that these were not declared as arrears in the prior year financial statements and reports of the University, implying that such reports were inaccurate. For some of the invoices that had been long outstanding, there were no demand notes from suppliers, while for commitments generated within the University were not supported with proper accountability. Under the circumstances, the team did not obtain adequate assurance that the amounts in question were expended for the purposes intended.

Recommendations

The Accounting Officer should:

1. always fully disclose all unpaid arrears in the University Financial statements so as to portray a more accurate financial position of the University’s state of financial affairs.
2. ensure that all payments in lieu of arrears are always properly supported in accordance with the requirements by the financial regulations.

7.6.3 Contract Staff Salaries

A total of UGX.3,156,480,833 was paid to Staff in this category and the following irregularities were noted:

1. A considerable amount of this money was not declared or correctly reported as
salaries; instead it was coded as either allowances or other education costs. Such mischarge of expenditure is contrary to the Chart of Accounts which defines the nature of expenditures for each item code and is therefore irregular.

(2) Some Staff paid as ‘contract staff’ were not included in the Staff list shared with the audit team for verification. It was further noted, that these Staff were not known by the HR Directorate of the University. And as such, it was not clear in whose interest they were hired.

(3) The audit further noted that there was no evidence to show whether the performance of these Staff was guided by detailed contract terms specifying the deliverables they were to make and that their performance was being periodically evaluated. Accordingly, it was not possible to assess whether there was value for money attained from hiring and paying for these contract Staff.

Details are in Appendix 22 of the Special Audit Report.

**Recommendation**
The University Management should:

(1) ensure that all expenditures in lieu of contract Staff salaries are always accurately posted as such

(2) follow up the Staff in question to establish the circumstances under which they were hired and paid by the respective Colleges.

**7.6.4 Unsupported Payments in lieu of Repairs and Servicing**

During the period under review, a total of UGX.210,313,150 paid by the University in lieu of various repairs and services was not properly supported (refer to Appendix 23 of the Special Audit Report for details). It was noted that prior to the payments in question, there was no evidence of inspection and certification by respective technical personnel. For motor vehicle service and repairs, there were no Pre- and Post-inspection Reports availed. Consequently, the extent of mechanical faults, actual repairs undertaken and the cost, could not be ascertained. Such a practice exposes the University to a risk of loss through payments for fictitious repairs and works.

**Recommendation**
The University Management should ensure that inspections are done before and after repairs are undertaken to confirm the extent of the works needed, undertaken and paid for, which should be appropriately supported by Pre- and Post-inspection Reports.

**7.6.4.1 Payment of Extra Load Allowances**

Extra load allowances are paid to Staff who teach beyond the required minimum of ten (10) hours a week. It was noted that payments amounting to UGX.3,300,633,659 made to various individuals as extra load allowances during the period under review were not properly supported. Details are in Appendix 24 of the Special Audit Report. The following observations were made regarding the payments in question;

(1) There were no individual letters of assignment of extra load, issued to Lecturers by the Human Resource Director.

(2) There were no daily teaching schedules filled in by the Lecturers and hence no supervisor confirmation was given for extra load time per Lecturer per payment. In some cases where these were attached, there were indications that the schedule was signed off on a single day for all hours claimed, which is unrealistic.
Recommendations

(1) The University management should maintain daily teaching attendance registers for Lecturers, which should be signed off daily by the lecturers, and approved by their Supervisors.

(2) The Human Resource Directorate should be involved in approvals of such extra load and to keenly follow up the administration of this facility.

(3) This process should be automated to improve the process integrity.

7.6.4.2 Advances without Proper Accountability

A review of the expenditure records revealed that a sum of UGX.626,330,007 as detailed in Appendix 25 of the Special Audit Report paid to cater for various activities either remained unaccounted for or had insufficient accountabilities. The following observations were made;

(1) Fuel payments lacked consumption schedules, fuel receipts and summaries of activities to which the fuel relates.

(2) For travels abroad, there was no evidence of travel in form of invitation letters, boarding passes and proof of attendance at trainings or workshops.

(3) Financial support given to Staff for studies abroad were not supported by admission letters, accommodation invoices, health insurance invoices or any evidence of payment of bills.

(4) Payments made for supplies lacked goods received notes, delivery notes, supplier invoices and receipts for cash supplies.

(5) Payments in relation to allowances advanced for various activities and meetings lacked activity reports and minutes.

The above were attributed to absence of close follow up of such advances to ensure prompt submission of accountability. Accordingly, in the absence of proper accountability documents, it was difficult to confirm the genuineness of the activities and whether the funds were put to proper use.

Recommendations

(1) The University Management should ensure that all funds advanced to Staff are always promptly accounted for, failure of which, recovery measures should be instituted on the concerned Staff.

(2) Regarding the amount outstanding, the Accounting Officer should ensure that they are followed up appropriately, including initiating recovery measures from the concerned officials or even taking disciplinary action as provided for under the Financial Regulations.

7.6.4.3 Cheque Payments not posted in the Cashbooks

A comparison of bank statements with cash books revealed that payments totaling to UGX.2,179,129, appeared in the Bank Statements but were not posted in the Cashbooks. A summary of the affected Colleges and Departments is shown in Table 7.6.4 below:
### Table 7.6.4: Summary of Payments not posted in the Cashbook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC REGISTRAR</td>
<td>15,329,878</td>
<td>15,329,878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>103,124,100</td>
<td>103,124,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAT</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEES</td>
<td>59,247,670</td>
<td>223,867,000</td>
<td>283,114,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUSS</td>
<td>303,108,588</td>
<td>64,839,872</td>
<td>367,948,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBAMS</td>
<td>88,517,500</td>
<td>211,814,526</td>
<td>300,332,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCIS</td>
<td>59,904,862</td>
<td>1,080,500</td>
<td>60,985,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>120,943,400</td>
<td>120,943,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAS</td>
<td>4,237,500</td>
<td>1,029,000</td>
<td>5,266,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVAB</td>
<td>17,453,982</td>
<td>18,608,250</td>
<td>36,062,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Generating Units (IGU)</td>
<td>47,846,337</td>
<td>294,456,074</td>
<td>342,302,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>180,807,516</td>
<td>224,208,047</td>
<td>405,015,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBVENTION</td>
<td>118,784,527</td>
<td>118,784,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,020,521,333</td>
<td>1,158,687,796</td>
<td>2,179,209,129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the audit, the audit team requested for bank reconciliation statements to confirm whether these had been identified during the reconciliation process, but these were not availed by the time of concluding the audit. This could be attributed to incomplete posting of the Cashbooks on the Ledger Works system maintained by the Colleges and Departments. This in effect overstates the cash balance in the Cashbook for which there is no corresponding balance in the Bank. Details are in Appendix 26 of the Special Audit Report.

**Recommendation**

The accounting Officer and the Bursar should follow up these payments and confirm that they were genuine payments and that they were taken into consideration, during the reconciliation process.

### 7.7 AREAS PRONE TO INEFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES

#### 7.7.1 Redundant Staff Resulting from Outsourced Services

The University Council in its 3rd Special Management Meeting of 2014 on Human Resource issues held on Tuesday, 10th June, 2014, resolved to outsource University kitchen services in the halls of residence, thus rendering a number of kitchen Staff redundant. At the same meeting, Council also resolved to re-designate the redundant Staff as Cleaners. The decision by Council led to an increment in the number of Cleaners from 385 to 539 as summarised in Table 7.7.1 below:

#### Table 7.7.1: Payments to University Cleaners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of cleaners</th>
<th>Amounts paid as salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>UGX.2,676,045,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>UGX.3,377,474,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>UGX.2,444,232,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was noted that prior to the re-designation of Staff, the University had 385 permanent Cleaners, who were being assisted by 120 contract Staff. It was explained that, these were adequately meeting the University cleaning needs. The decision to re-designate Cooks as Cleaners was taken as a result of lack of funds to lay off the Cooks. However, an earlier decision taken to outsource cleaning services was never rescinded, thus causing inefficiencies in the provision of cleaning services.
In the year 2015/2016 the University paid a total of UGX.1,036,838,886 to six (6) companies providing cleaning services. It should be noted that the decision to outsource kitchen services in the halls of residence resulted into hiring out all kitchens to private firms and thus significantly reducing the cleaning requirements in the University. In light of the above, it is apparent that the University is paying cleaners for services not rendered and ultimately incurring expenditure which could be avoided.

**Recommendation**

The University Council should review its decisions to ensure that cleaning services are economically and efficiently delivered to the University.

### 7.7.2  Old Water Supply Network

National Water and Sewerage Corporation (NWSC) has one metre that measures all water supplied to the University Campus at the point of entry. Although, the Student population has been reducing over the period under review, the cost for water and sewerage services is on the increase and has currently surpassed the electricity cost, as summarised in Table 7.7.2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMEME</td>
<td>3,661,859,962</td>
<td>2,811,108,326</td>
<td>4,059,088,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>3,207,936,460</td>
<td>3,704,898,029</td>
<td>4,212,530,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was attributed to frequent pipe bursts and leakages of billed water. In addition, some premises still do not have individual water metres leading to excess usage without bothering about the bills.

**Recommendation**

The University should:

1. look into this matter and consider replacing the old piping network in order to fix all leakages.
2. introduce water metres to all premises in order to enforce close monitoring of usage of water by all stakeholders at the University.

### 7.7.3 Medical Expenses

On 12th October, 1995, the University entered into an agreement with M/S Crystal Holdings Ltd for renting space and provision of Medical and Radiological laboratory services to Makerere University Hospital Clients. This agreement was renewed in 2014. During the period under review, the University paid a total of UGX.1,577,383,920 to M/S Crystal Holdings Ltd as shown in Table 7.7.3 below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab services</td>
<td>175,827,940</td>
<td>876,341,320</td>
<td>525,214,660</td>
<td>1,577,383,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, it is apparent that the expenditure for laboratory services in 2014/2015 increased more than four times compared with that incurred in 2013/2014. The auditors were not provided with satisfactory justification for this massive increment. Furthermore, in 2015/16, the University paid UGX.708, 816, 296 for medical/veterinary supplies yet it had
only budgeted for UGX.175,725,550. There was no evidence of any authorisation for a re-allocation thus rendering excessive expenditure on this item unauthorised. A further drill down of this expenditure on individual student medical bills revealed a number of irregularities as explained below;

(1) Approximately 90% of the bills were for private Students who are only required to pay an optional fee of UGX.10,000 for University hospital registration. 

(2) The laboratory services were grossly abused by requesting for unnecessary lab tests in a bid to inflate the figure billed to the University. A case in point is on the 20th of March, 2015, where about 80% of the Students who purportedly turned up underwent 11 tests including a patient whose chief complaint was itching of the eyes (allergic conjunctivitis). 

(3) In a number of cases, a review of the patient files revealed that results for the numerous tests purportedly undertaken were not on file. 

(4) All lab requests seen lacked clinical notes to guide the lab technician. 

(5) There were instances where the University was billed at rates much higher than what was stipulated in the agreement. For example, Complete Blood Count would be charged UGX.15,000 instead of UGX.10,000, Stool analysis would be charged UGX.15,000 instead of UGX.10,000. 

(6) There was absence of a proper system of internal controls to ensure that the University was actually billed for the medical services rendered to Students in form of segregation of duties and proper authorisation.

From the foregoing, it was apparent that the University was incurring heavy costs on private Students who did not pay for such a service. In addition, some of the claims were inflated by tests that were either not done or were unnecessary.

Recommendations

The University should:

(1) upgrade the University Hospital services with functional laboratory services to serve the Staff and Students, both on Government and Private sponsorship. 

(2) have privately sponsored students pay for the services received from the hospital at subsidised rates. 

(3) investigate the University Hospital for any acts of fraud with a view of streamlining its operations. 

(4) strengthen the internal control system regarding the treatment of Students, authorisation and payment of medical bills. 

(5) review the Contract of M/s Crystal Holdings Ltd with a view of assessing performance and ironing out of any inefficiency that might be identified during such a review.

7.7.4 Student Meals

The University spent a total of UGX.1,601,369,123 on meals for Students over the last two years. However, the University payments were not supported by records of the actual number of Students who received the services. Payments were supported by the total number of Students ‘expected’ or ‘planned’ to receive the services. Using ‘expected’ rather than ‘actual’ numbers creates a risk of paying for meals not consumed as Student turn-up can hardly be
100% every day. This anomaly is attributable to lack of proper controls regarding serving of Student meals.

**Recommendation**

The University should revisit the model of payment of Student meals under Government merit scholarship.

### 7.7.5 Legal Services

The University incurred a sum of UGX.1,529,075,452 for provision of legal services by two external law firms over the last 3 years. The team noted that the University has a Legal Directorate, and on its 136th Meeting, Council resolved that this Unit should represent the University in all legal matters. However, to date, this has not been implemented because of two shortcomings: the Unit has failed to secure chamber status, and 5 out of the 12 established posts are vacant, which include the two top most positions. It was further noted that most of the cases brought against the University are related to Staff and Land matters, which should have either been amicably settled or avoided. The Committee received memoranda pointing to the several cases lost even with external legal representation.

Paying for external legal services when there is an established Directorate of Legal Affairs amounts to wasteful expenditure. Besides, external services are quite expensive. For example, the University incurred a bill of UGX.600 million in legal fees in one case alone, regarding pension management by National Insurance Corporation.

**Recommendation**

The University should expeditiously fill the vacant positions, secure the chamber status for their Directorate and subsequently require the Directorate to represent them in all future legal matters.

### 7.8 FINANCIAL DECISION MAKING AND INTERNAL AUDIT FUNCTION

Financial decision making within the University is undertaken at different levels of management. At the top is the University Council, which is the supreme governing body of the University responsible for management and control of the finances (Section 40 of the UOTIA 2001 as amended). The Council is responsible for the overall financial affairs of the University (Section 40(2) UOTIA 2001 as amended) and for the formulation of policies for the management of financial matters at the University (Section 41(g) UOTIA 2001 as amended).

The Vice Chancellor (VC), as the Chief Executive Officer, is responsible for all aspects of institutional management, including the management of financial affairs; and chairs the Management Committee of the University. The VC is assisted by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Finance and Administration). On the other hand, the Internal Audit Directorate headed by the Acting Internal Audit Director, is charged with overseeing the effectiveness of the internal control systems in the University, to ensure proper implementation of University activities, including enterprise risk management.

The audit teams reviewed the functionality of each management level and made the following observations;

#### 7.8.1 The University Council

The University Council is the supreme organ of the University and is responsible for the overall governance of the University and ensuring due implementation of the objects and
functions of the University. In line with its statutory function, the Council is mandated to approve policies, approve budget proposals, provide financial oversight and review final accounts submitted by Management. However, a review of Council operations in regard to financial decision making revealed the following gaps that likely affect decision making:

(1) The decision making processes of the Council appears to be guided with biased information favoring implementation of particular decisions at the expense of the agreed University objectives. It was observed that in several instances, especially relating to Staff welfare and benefits, the Council appeared to lack control of the decision making process. Many of the assumptions put forward at the time of decision making did not stand the test of time. This has led to massive arrears in the areas of pension, incentive allowances, and salaries which were not foreseen at the time of decision making. Sporadic strikes also resulted in ad hoc decision making, aimed at firefighting the situation at hand. According to the University Management, most decisions were influenced by circumstances prevailing, notably strikes and as a result there was inadequate time to put together the necessary information before final decisions was made.

(2) The composition of Council as per UOTIA, 2001 as amended, makes it difficult for the Council to be objectively independent considering that ten (10) of the members are University Staff. This creates a potential conflict of interest, since most of the decisions affect the persons passing them.

7.8.2 The Audit Committee

The Audit Committee provides oversight role of the University’s risk management practices, reviews and approves the internal audit plan, and reviews the effectiveness of the University control systems and practices. A review of the roles and responsibilities of the Audit Committee revealed the following:

(1) The Audit Committee is tasked to consider the various Internal Audit Reports of the University. Reports of the Audit Committee are supposed to be discussed by the main Council and resolutions made for adoption of recommendations. This function is still very weak as re-affirmed under Min.2/20/AC/2015 of the 20th Audit Committee meeting which stated that the audit function was faced with a challenge of inadequate action by Management on the implementation of internal audit recommendations.

(2) There were no follow up mechanisms on the extent of Management implementation of Council resolutions in regard to Audit recommendations. This left the University exposed to risks which will have been identified by the internal audit function.

(3) A review of the Minutes of the Audit Committee revealed a pattern of irregular meetings. It was noted that the Committee is supposed to meet once every quarter to discharge its mandate. However, in the period under review, the Committee had met a total of 9 times out of the expected 12.

(4) The Committee did not discuss and address the issues raised in the External Audit Reports or follow up on the recommendations of Parliament.

7.8.3 The Financial Planning and Administration Committee of Council

The Financial Planning and Administration Committee (FPAC) is empowered, on behalf of the University Council to: approve budget revisions and formulate policy on investment management; advise Council on financial and resource planning for the University; receive advice from University Secretary on the education profile, strategic plans, resource allocation and performance. In addition, the Committee provides technical advisory services to Council
on financial management issues as required by Council from time to time. A review of the roles and responsibilities of the Committee revealed the following:

(1) The Finance Procedures Manual did not provide for the involvement of the FPAC in the decision-making processes of the various Units of the University, particularly where there were budget revisions or variations by the Colleges.

(2) The FPAC was not being consulted on borrowing of money by the University. The Visitation Committee observed that the University borrowed a total of UGX.13,823,390,798 from the Presidential Initiative on S&T Projects to support various activities of the University. The Visitation Committee was not availed with a Committee Minute approving such borrowing.

7.8.4 The Top Management Team

The Top Management Team TMT is responsible for reviewing, considering and making recommendations to the FPAC on various issues with financial implication for onward recommendation to the Council. This Management Team is chaired by the Vice Chancellor and has the membership of the various Heads of Directorates. The Team is also responsible for implementation of the directives and policies of Council.

7.8.5 University Secretary

The University Secretary (US) is also the Accounting Officer of the University as provided for in the PFMA, 2015 (as amended), and is responsible for ensuring that the accountability obligations of the University are met. In line with the PFMA, he/she is responsible for the general administration of the University, including custody of the seal. He/she is further supposed to ensure that adequate controls are exercised over commitments and that effective systems of internal control are put in place in respect of all transactions and resources under his/her control. In addition, he/she is supposed to ensure that the internal audit function is in place and operational.

A review of the operating environment of the University Secretary revealed the following:

(1) The Function of the US is provided for in the UOTIA as well as the Public Finance Management Act, 2015. The Committee observed a conflict of duties between the functions of the US and those of the VC as stipulated in the two laws. Section 31 of UOTIA 2001 as amended, provides that the VC is responsible for the financial affairs of the University while the US is charged with the general administration of the University and Accounting Officer.

(2) The UOTIA provides that the US shall be answerable to the VC. However, under the Public Finance Management Act, the Accounting Officer is responsible and personally accountable to Parliament and PS/ST for the activities of the University.

(3) The functionality of the US provides a stark difference with his duty to report to the VC considering the fact that he is personally culpable and responsible for all monies and assets of the University.

7.8.6 The University Bursar

The University Bursar (UB) is responsible for the financial administration and planning of the University. He/she is responsible for maintaining the University accounts in a form determined by the University Council. In addition, he/she coordinates the annual financial accounting and reporting of the University. He/she also oversees the daily performance of the financial transactions and ensures that the Financial Management Practices and Procedures Manual is kept up-to-date. He/she is also expected to identify, maintain and document
financial policies and procedures and ensure that all internal controls for financial operations promote and support the professional standards of the accounting profession, applicable statutes and regulations.

7.8.7 Principals, Directors, Deans and Heads of Departments

Principals, Directors, Deans and Heads of Departments are responsible for ensuring that their respective Units comply with all requirements of GOU, University and Donors in the use of resources. They direct the manner in which their respective Units report on their financial activities, construct annual budgets that incorporate their means of achieving strategic objectives and mitigating unacceptable risks. They also have to explain budget variances from expected budget conditions. Additional roles are found in the Universities and other Tertiary institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University), 2012.

The following observations were made:

(1) The audit team was not availed with any evidence that the Principals of the different Colleges were formally appointed by the US to execute on his behalf the sub-accounting officer’s role. The Principals therefore lacked the responsibility and personal accountability which comes with exercising this mandate.

(2) A review of the Universities and other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statute of 2012 revealed that the Principals were the administrative and financial officers of the Colleges and were supposed to directly report to the University Council about the execution of their mandate.

(3) The Universities and other Tertiary Institutions (Management of Constituent Colleges of Makerere University) Statute, 2012 provides that the Principals are responsible to the Vice Chancellor. This is in contravention with the PFMA, 2015, which gives this responsibility to the University Secretary as the overall Accounting Officer.

The fact that the US is not consulted by the College Principals provides a flaw in the accountability chain as he/she will not be in position to effectively execute his/her mandate as the Accounting Officer.

Recommendations

(1) The different pieces of Statutes need to be harmonised and updated to ensure an effective financial decision making process.

(2) The weaknesses within Council need to be addressed to ensure attainment of the overall University objectives.

(3) College Principals should be formally appointed as Sub Accounting Officers in line with the PFMA, 2015.

7.8.8 Internal Audit Function

A review of the Internal Audit function revealed the following;

7.8.8.1 Understaffing of the Internal Audit Department

The approved Internal Audit Charter of 2014 specifies a staff strength of 18 people in the Internal Audit Department. However, by the time of the Audit, only 10 positions were filled and a key position of Director Internal Audit has remained vacant for more than 2 years.

Furthermore, the University has over the years increased its reliance on IT systems; however, the Internal Audit Unit has not moved in tandem with the developments. By the time of the
Audit, the Department did not have any specialised IT Auditors despite having a number of systems in the University which process and record payments and Students’ information.

7.8.8.2 Unclear Internal Audit Strategy

Internal Audit services range from internal control assurance to risk management assurance, which are implemented through the pre-audit/compliance audit function and systems audit function, respectively. The choice of which one should be predominant is based on management’s risk appetite; however, many organisations have adopted the systems audit approach with a view of minimising risks.

The University Finance Manual, 2014 requires all payments above UGX.2m to be pre-audited by the Internal Audit Department prior to payment. The Audit Committee meeting held on 20th September, 2012, pointed out that Council approved partial phase out of pre-auditing activities by the Internal Audit Department. In a letter referenced Mak/US/051/2017, the University Secretary guided that all transactions between UGX.5m and UGX.50m should be pre-audited prior to payment until further guidelines are communicated. In addition, the office of the University Bursar set up an independent examination unit that scrutinises payment documents before they are passed for payment.

From the above, there seemed to be no clear policy on the pre-auditing function of the Internal Audit, as the messages from those charged with Governance appeared to be conflicting. As a result of the above, a number of transactions get paid before undergoing scrutiny.

It should also be noted that the function of pre-audit is quite time-consuming given the number of transactions compared to the Staff strength of the Department. This led to Internal Audit being preoccupied with the pre-audit function at the expense of systems review. This increases the risk profile of the University and reduces the visibility of the Internal Audit function, as results of the pre-audit function are never circulated for all to appreciate.

Recommendations

The University should:

(1) address the staffing gaps within the Internal Audit Department in regard to the required numbers of Staff and skills.

(2) agree on the Internal Audit Strategy, and harmonise its policies and guidelines regarding the pre-audit functionality.

7.9 FINANCIAL AND OTHER RISKS FACING THE UNIVERSITY

7.9.1 University Indebtedness (Payables)

A payable can be defined as an obligation to a supplier or vendor for goods or services that were provided in advance of payment.

During the audit, it was established that the University is heavily indebted. In a letter dated, 22nd September, 2016 addressed to the Permanent Secretary/Secretary to the Treasury (PS/ST), the University sought the intervention of the GOU to settle outstanding arrears (payables) of UGX.130,088,741,349. The following observations were made, during examination of these payables;

7.9.1.1 Reconciliation of Declarations made by the University

The auditors were availed another schedule of the total payables of the University as at 31st December, 2016 which amounted to UGX.73,265,743,765. This implied that the University
had since managed to clear a total of UGX 56,822,997,584, which had been declared to the PS/ST in September, 2016. This is summarised in Table 7.9.1-1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount as at September 2016 (UGX)</th>
<th>Amount as at December 2016 (UGX)</th>
<th>VARIANCE – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Incentive</td>
<td>37,716,594,521</td>
<td>32,952,893,506</td>
<td>4,763,701,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension arrears</td>
<td>3,234,002,946</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,234,002,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Administration Plan</td>
<td>12,985,465,902</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,985,465,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Administration Plan interest</td>
<td>17,697,851,065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,697,851,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un remitted Deposit Administration Plan 2013-2015</td>
<td>2,890,682,806</td>
<td>2,379,293,278</td>
<td>511,389,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers and pending vouchers</td>
<td>4,060,730,076</td>
<td>4,000,033,109</td>
<td>60,696,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>4,320,640,618</td>
<td>3,670,043,829</td>
<td>650,596,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examiners</td>
<td>1,019,822,287</td>
<td>130,688,619</td>
<td>889,133,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recess term</td>
<td>64,710,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship to colleges</td>
<td>670,520,440</td>
<td>314,790,800</td>
<td>355,729,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching claims</td>
<td>2,340,401,035</td>
<td>794,917,710</td>
<td>1,545,483,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds not remitted to Presidential projects</td>
<td>4,900,000,000</td>
<td>4,900,040,000</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds not remitted to Centre for Research in Transportation Technology</td>
<td>8,923,350,798</td>
<td>8,923,350,798</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2016 salary deficit</td>
<td>10,423,943,457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,423,943,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>130,088,741,349</td>
<td>73,265,743,765</td>
<td>56,822,997,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audit team reviewed all expenditures of the University since the September, 2016 submissions and observed that only a total of UGX 47,304,108,423 had indeed been paid to settle some of the payables declared in September 2016, as shown in Table 7.9.1-2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount – UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Incentive allowances for February 2016</td>
<td>3,720,495,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DAP and DAP Interest</td>
<td>30,683,316,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2016 salary deficit</td>
<td>10,423,943,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Recess term</td>
<td>64,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Payment to different suppliers and beneficiaries</td>
<td>2,411,642,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Payment</td>
<td>47,304,108,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above analysis, a total of UGX 9,518,889,161 (derived as UGX 56,822,997,584 – UGX 47,304,108,423) which was earlier declared in September 2016 as payables could neither be traced in the payables total submitted for audit in December, 2016, nor in the payments made during the period September to December 2016. This points to a likelihood of fictitious declarations of payables by the University Management.

There was no logical explanation for the amount of UGX 9,518,889,161 which was finally dropped.

Recommendation

The inconsistency in payables declarations should further be subjected to investigation to rule out any possibility of fraudulent intentions.
7.9.1.2 Verification of Payables submitted during the Audit

As noted above, Payables amounting to UGX.73,265,743,765 were submitted for audit review, as at 31st December 2016. The audit team conducted a circularisation of the payables status to different User Departments/Units in the University with a view of establishing the authenticity and completeness of the submitted schedule of payables. The team was able to verify a total of UGX.55,580,424,831 as genuine payables as at that date, excluding the In-house Retirement Benefits. The balance of payables totaling to UGX. 2,520,318,000 could not be verified. Table 7.9.1-3 below gives a summary of the same;

Table 7.9.1-3: Summary of the University Indebtedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount Declared - UGX</th>
<th>Amount Verified - UGX</th>
<th>Variance - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Incentive Arrears (Staff)</td>
<td>14,800,000,000</td>
<td>13,984,806,613</td>
<td>815,193,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive PAYE</td>
<td>18,152,893,506</td>
<td>18,152,893,506</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unremitted pension DAP 2013-2015</td>
<td>2,379,293,278</td>
<td>2,379,293,278</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers and pending vouchers</td>
<td>4,000,033,109</td>
<td>3,612,302,039</td>
<td>387,731,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>3,670,043,829</td>
<td>3,670,043,829</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External examiners</td>
<td>130,688,619</td>
<td>123,042,600</td>
<td>7,646,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship to colleges</td>
<td>314,790,800</td>
<td>94,404,800</td>
<td>220,386,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching claims</td>
<td>794,917,710</td>
<td>480,895,756</td>
<td>314,021,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds not remitted to Presidential projects</td>
<td>4,900,040,000</td>
<td>4,124,700,430</td>
<td>775,339,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team noted that from 2011-2016 a total of UGX.13,823,390,798 was borrowed by the University from Centre for Research in Transport Technology (CRTT)-Kiira EV and Presidential Initiative for STI Projects towards the payment of salary top up, and in some instances for the payment of utilities and suppliers as indicated in the table below;

Table 7.9.1-4: Amounts of Borrowed Project Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRTT (Kiira EV Project)</td>
<td>8,923,350,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Initiative</td>
<td>4,900,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,823,390,798</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was further noted that out of the borrowed funds, only UGX.775,339,570 was refunded to the Projects during the period under review leaving a total of UGX.13,048,051,228 outstanding. The continued borrowing of funds meant for Projects without refunding the same, has frustrated the execution of the said Projects. This further extends the lifespan of Projects beyond what was initially planned for. Therefore, the Projects were financially constrained to attain their intended objectives in a timely manner.

Recommendation

The University Management should refund all outstanding Project funds without further delay.

7.9.1.4 Staff Incentive Allowance

In 2013, the Academic Staff demanded a 100% salary increment or else they lay down their tools (Refer to Minute SP04/03/05/2013, of the special meeting of the University Council held on 03rd May 2013). The implementation of this demand required an additional UGX 75,473,584,354 to the wage bill of the University, which was not readily available. In a bid to avert the strike, the University Council decided to reorganise the University budget with a view to harmonise the existing allowances into an incentive for all staff of the University.

As a result of this action, the University projected that the budget readjustment would save the University a total of UGX 40,125,607,935, which savings would be paid out to all Staff in an allowance dubbed ‘Incentive Allowance’. In approving the payment of the incentive allowances, the Council resolved that;

(1) The payment of all top-up allowances and other allowances be abolished effective 01st July 2013.

(2) The Incentive allowances were not supposed to be paid to any Staff member who was on study leave or on secondment.

The audit teams made the following observations from the review of the information provided to the Committee:

(1) Irregular Budget Reallocations during FY 2013/14

Under the Council Minute of 29th August 2013, Council directed management to make reallocations within the approved University budget for the FY 2013/14, with the aim of making a saving to meet the incentive allowance expenditure.

This decision to make reallocations within the approved University budget for the FY 2013/14 was made at the start of the financial year after Parliament had approved the University budget. Over the three years, Council has been approving a balanced budget with incentive allowances fully provided for; however, these have never been fully paid due to the following reasons;

i. The internally generated revenue was always overstated in the budget and the performance was always below 90% leading to build up of arrears in unpaid allowances.

ii. Funds budgeted for incentives were diverted to finance other non-planned activities creating instances of over expenditure on certain budget lines. An over expenditure of UGX.11,062,968,387 was occasioned over the past three years, salient among the diversions was UGX.1,614,847,338 diverted to finance travel abroad. (Appendix 27 of Special Audit Report for details).

iii. A review of the Cashbook revealed that the University continued to expend on items which were earlier abolished by the University Council to facilitate the incentive
allowance. These items included payments for extra load, supervision, invigilation and marking allowances. In addition, Council backtracked and earmarked UGX.5bn to cater for top-up allowances to Academic Staff in congested Colleges.

(2) Unsustainability of the Incentive Allowance

The primary intention of the incentive allowance was to act as a stop-gap measure as Government organised resources to enhance the University Staff salaries by 100% as requested by the Staff.

It was noted that the Council resolution to initiate the incentive allowance provided that this allowance would only be provided subject to availability of funds to the University. The various Council Minutes reviewed indicated that the University has been struggling to meet the financial obligation brought as a result of the introduction of the incentive allowance resulting in reallocation of money from different areas to cater for the top up of salaries.

The University has resorted to diverting funds from other sources and Projects (as mentioned under paragraph (c) above), to fund the incentive allowance payments and as a result affecting the operations of the said Projects and other planned activities.

(3) Unpaid Incentive Arrears

It was noted that a total of UGX.13,984,806,613 of arrears for incentive allowances remained unpaid as per the schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Amount Owed - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>3,549,036,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>3,489,584,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>3,478,162,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>3,468,021,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,984,806,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee is of the view that the payment of the incentive allowance is untenable and an unnecessary burden on the University’s financial resources.

(4) University Council Indecision on Incentive Allowances

In the audit exercise, it was observed that the University Council left the issues of incentive allowances either undecided, amid poor financial conditions at the university or its decisions were not implemented by Management. The following scenarios were noted which demonstrate Council’s indecisiveness and non-implementation of its decisions:

i. At its 137th Meeting held on 02nd and 3rd February, 2016, the University Council resolved that the incentive allowances payable to Staff be reduced by 25% effective FY 2016/17 if the 2nd Salary enhancement is paid as promised by GOU. The Council also observed that the University was experiencing a bad financial situation. However, this was not implemented despite Government making a second salary enhancement as per the Ministry of Public Service Consolidated Salary structure of MUK of 2016/17.

ii. In a special Meeting of Council on 01st September, 2016 focusing on the sustainability of the incentive allowances, the Council agreed that there should be a 25% incentive retention for Top Management, Directors, College leadership and Academic Staff; and 50% incentive retention for Administrative and Support Staff effective 01st July, 2016. However, there was no evidence availed to show that this resolution was implemented by the University Management.
iii. The Council, at the same Meeting in (ii), above, also agreed that the Management makes reallocations within the budget to raise UGX.7.5Bn to enable payment of the incentives at the proposed rate.

iv. In a meeting held between the Vice Chairperson of Council, members of Management and MUASA executive on 14th September, 2016, it was resolved that the Council decision of 01st September, 2016 regarding the suspension of the incentive allowance be suspended until Council sits on 21st October 2016 to revisit the decision. It was observed that this was a peculiar scenario as it suggests that the decisions of the Council are subject to revision by the Vice Chairperson of the Council, Management, and MUASA executive members. This defeats the mandate of the Council and should not be encouraged.

v. At the same Meeting, in (iv) above, it was resolved that Management provides Council with a roadmap for payment of the incentive arrears. It was observed that in the Council meeting of 1st September 2016, Council had considered the opinion of the Finance, Planning, Administration, and Investment Committee (FPAIC). It was therefore unclear what other input of Management was necessary.

At the time of our visit, the position of Council was unclear in regard to the tenure of the incentive allowance. Accordingly, it was therefore difficult to establish whether there existed any arrears for the period after June 2016.

**Recommendations**

(1) Government should continue honouring its pledge to enhance the staff salaries.

(2) Payment of incentive allowances should be abolished.

(3) The University should consider recruiting the requisite Staff to enable a more amiable Student to Staff ratio, so as to remove the ring-fenced top-up allowance paid to Staff with high Student numbers.

### 7.9.1.5 Makerere University Pension Schemes

The University declared a total of UGX.17,578,985,394 as outstanding pension liability. The declared figure is for amounts owed in payment of Pension, In-House Retirement Benefits Scheme and unremitted Deposit Administration Plan (DAP) as per the summary in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Pension Scheme</th>
<th>Amount Owing - UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-house Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>15,199,692,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Un-remitted DAP</td>
<td>2,379,293,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,578,985,394</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University has over the years undergone changes in the management of Staff pensions as explained below:

(1) **Interim Award**

This existed between the years 1993 and 1996 and was established by the 67th Meeting of Council to address the effects of the currency reform of 1987. Interim Award was a one off payment to Staff who reached the mandatory age of service of 60 years of service between May 1987 and June 1996.
(2) In-house Retirement Benefit Scheme (IHRBS)

The IHRBS was established in the period between 01st July 1996 and 31st March 2009 as a replacement of the Interim award. This was a non-contributory scheme which was supposed to be funded by putting aside 10% of the revenue collected from Internally Generated Funds (Refer to Council Minutes of its 78th and 79th Meeting held on 23-25th August 1998).

The amount owed to Staff was supposed to be calculated as per Government of Uganda pension formula. It was observed that the approved formula for payment of the retirement package was not matched with the budgetary requirements to support the payments. This in effect, generated a burden on the finances of the University and ultimately created unpaid obligations of UGX.15,199,692,116 owing to 2,122 Staff as per the payables information of the University.

(3) Misstatement of the amounts owed by the University in IHRBS

The audit team observed material misstatements of the amounts owed by the University to different beneficiaries as IHRBS. The team could not undertake a full review of all the outstanding amounts due to the lack of adequate and complete information. The misstatement can be attributed to a number of reasons:

(4) Overpayment

From the sample reviewed, a number of overpayments by the University to some of the beneficiaries of the IHRBS were noted. It was noted that in spite of the overpayment of the said individuals, they were still included in the schedule of payables presented by the University. Appendix 28 of the Special Audit Report shows a sample of cases of overpayment totaling to UGX.206,675,584. This is based on the available information on the system used to manage pension payments.

(5) Fully Paid but on the Payable Schedule

It was observed that individuals who had been fully paid under the scheme were included in the schedule of payables declared by the University; however, their names were included among those owed money by the University. This is irregular and can be exploited to defraud the University. Details in Appendix 29 of the Special Audit Report.

(6) Partially Paid but not adjusted in the payables

It was observed that the University has made partial payments to several former Staff in respect of the IHRBS pension entitlements. However, the team noted that no deduction of the said payments was made on the amounts owed. It was also noted that a total of UGX.1,275,656,452 was paid prior to the December submission of payables but no reconciliation of the amounts was made by the University. Details in Appendix 30 the Special Audit Report.

(7) Differing Dates of Joining

The formula used to calculate the IHRBS gratuity heavily relies on the number years of service, and a review of a sample of Staff on the schedule of payables revealed gross differences between the dates of joining used for the calculation and the dates on the personal files. Analysis of the dates revealed extreme cases in which Staff purportedly started working before attaining 18 years of age. This in effect inflates the amount owed to different personnel considering the purported length of stay on the payroll.
Recommendations

The University should:

(1) undertake a detailed verification of the pensioners and the amounts owed to each must be reconciled with amounts paid so far.

(2) should recover the funds in instances of over payments.

(8) Deposit Administration Plan (DAP)

The Deposit Administration Plan (DAP) was set up by Council on 01st July, 1996 and was initially administered by the National Insurance Cooperation (NIC) as a contributory Scheme where the University deducts 5% of the employees pay and in turn contributes 10% to the scheme. DAP replaced the Retirement Benefit Scheme (RBS) which was being administered by NIC and now Makerere University Retirement Benefit Scheme (MURBS).

A total of UGX.2,379,293,278 was unremitted as DAP to the MURBS. It was further noted that due to cash constraints, the Staff were paid net amounts after deduction of their contributions. However both Staff and University contributions were not paid into the benefits scheme. The continued nonpayment of contributions may lead to attraction of interest and penalties under the Uganda Retirement Benefits Regulatory Authority Act, 2011 for handling Pension.

Recommendation

The University should prioritise the remittance of the said amounts so as to avoid the accumulation of penalties.

7.9.1.6 Unremitted Statutory Deductions (Regulators)

The payables schedule of the University revealed that the University has not remitted statutory deductions for and on behalf of different Staff and Suppliers contrary to the various Regulations as follows;

(1) National Social Security Fund contributions (NSSF)

Section 14(1) of the NSSF Act obliges every contributing employer to pay to the fund a standard contribution of 15% calculated on the total wages paid during that month to an eligible employee, failure of which attracts a penalty.

An Audit Report by NSSF dated 08th October 2009, for the period January, 2003 to December, 2008, revealed that the University owes a total of UGX.309,789,769,963 (Refer to NSSF Audit Report for the Period 2003-2008).

The matter is however before the Courts of Law vide HCCS No. 61 of 2011 NSSF Vs Makerere University, making it sub-judice. However, the University has not disclosed this matter in their financial statements as required by reporting standards.

According to Management, the University continues to deduct money from the salaries of the Staff and remitting it to the MURBS. In addition, NSSF contribution for contract Staff are deducted pending remittance to NSSF. Under this category, a total of UGX.1,642,967,265 is due for remittance to NSSF.

Recommendation

The University should remit all undisputed amounts due to NSSF as they await the outcome of the court cases on the dispute.
(2) Payments to URA (PAYE and WHT)

The University owes a total of UGX.18,505,683,829 as unremitted taxes to URA arising from unpaid PAYE on incentive allowances and withheld taxes from suppliers.

It was noted that of the stated figure, a total of UGX.18,152,893,506 was in respect unremitted PAYE arising from incentive allowances, while UGX.352,790,323 was in regard to withholding tax, which ought to have been remitted at the time of paying suppliers. Such delays in remittance of the deducted taxes expose the University to a risk of penalties in line with the provisions under the Income Tax Act.

Recommendations

(1) This situation should be investigated and the responsible officials brought to account.
(2) The University should prioritise the payment of the unremitted taxes.

7.9.1.7 Contingent Liability

A contingent liability is a potential liability that may occur, depending on the outcome of an uncertain future event. A contingent liability is disclosed in the accounting records if the contingency is probable and the amount of the liability can be reasonably estimated.

It was observed that the University currently has a total of 92 cases pending before the Courts of Law as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of Appeal</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

The University should:

(1) set up a system to not only monitor court cases, but also alleviate exposure of the University to litigation.
(2) examine and address the root causes of the issues which expose it to continuous litigation and address them to avoid further exposure.
(3) implement the University Council resolution to empower the Directorate of Legal and Advisory Services to handle the cases against the University as a means of limiting the costs of litigation originating from hiring external counsel.

7.9.2 Foreign Exchange Risk

The University engaged in a number of foreign currency transactions under both revenue and expenditure. This exposed it to foreign exchange risk resulting from movement of exchange rates between transaction and payment dates. The team reviewed the financial statements to ascertain the extent of foreign risk exposure. Table 7.9.2-1 shows the net losses and gains resulting from foreign currency transactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Losses/gains</strong></td>
<td>(28,207,284)</td>
<td>(2,780,127)</td>
<td>(54,105,664)</td>
<td>(2,641,129)</td>
<td>6,126,876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table, it can be seen that the University’s exposure to foreign exchange risk was minimal with the University making a net gain in 2015/2016. However, it should be noted that though the net effect was insignificant, the University still lost a lot of money in foreign currency expenditure transactions but this was offset by gains made from translations of foreign currency denominated revenue.

The University did not have a Hedging Policy and as such made losses through transactions denominated in foreign currency. Table 7.9.2-2 below shows a sample of such transactions where currency fluctuations between the transaction date and the payment date led to substantial losses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Details</th>
<th>Contract sum (USD)</th>
<th>Rate at contract date</th>
<th>Rate at payment date</th>
<th>Foreign exchange loss (UGX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply and installation software</td>
<td>73,640</td>
<td>2,609.10</td>
<td>3,810.00</td>
<td>88,434,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply, installation of electric Laboratory work</td>
<td>201,302</td>
<td>2,603.43</td>
<td>3,460.00</td>
<td>152,298,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and installation of Soil Mechanics Lab Equipment</td>
<td>148,887</td>
<td>2,536.62</td>
<td>3,810.00</td>
<td>189,590,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply and installation of 2 HP Servers and 120 thin clients for COCIS</td>
<td>79,581</td>
<td>2,565.67</td>
<td>3,588.14</td>
<td>81,369,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>511,693,423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it can be seen that the foreign exchange losses of the University were masked by the gains giving a minimal net effect. However, the University can further minimise foreign exchange losses by hedging expenditure transactions. The simplest of which is the implementation of the Permanent Secretary/Secretary to the Treasury directive to award all local contracts for works, goods, and services in Uganda shillings (Circular reference BPD 86/150/01).

7.9.3 Credit Risk

Analysis of the University receivables over a period of 4 years indicated that receivables as at year end showed an upward trend. By 2015/2016, the receivables figure was reported as UGX.5,509,794,457, which translates into 2.7% of the total University revenue (Table 7.9.3, Figure 7.9.3). This is a high percentage given that the University had cheap and effective mechanisms to collect all its revenue. The increase in the receivables figure was attributed to unpaid tuition and affiliation fees by students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount (UGX)</td>
<td>630,545,566</td>
<td>4,914,675,690</td>
<td>4,737,680,784</td>
<td>5,509,794,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the University did not have a policy on aging of its debtors, and as such, it was not in position to identify which receivables were long overdue to have the appropriate action taken.

**Recommendations**

The University should ensure that:

1. revenue is efficiently collected.
2. all outstanding revenues are collected immediately.

### 7.9.4 Liquidity Risk

Analysis of year-end figures revealed a worsening liquidity position for the University over a three-year period. Comparison of year-end current assets with current liabilities revealed a current ratio of 0.42 in 2015/2016, which was way below the accepted norm of 1.0 (Table 7.9.4). The University payables were mainly resulting from unpaid Staff emoluments which are long overdue and have already resulted in a number of litigations. It should also be noted that the payables figures used were as reported in the financial statements; however, these were grossly understated as raised in the Auditor General’s Report of 2015/2016. From the foregoing, it was clear that the University’s receivables and cash balances were insufficient to cover the University’s short-term liabilities, without additional funding, which reflects an unfavorable liquidity position.

**Table 7.9.4: The Current Ratios for a 3 Year Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash as at Year End</th>
<th>Receivables at Year End</th>
<th>Payables at Year End</th>
<th>Current Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>19,792,172,134</td>
<td>4,914,675,690</td>
<td>56,228,653,681</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>19,049,024,840</td>
<td>4,737,680,784</td>
<td>51,704,481,942</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>14,426,112,034</td>
<td>5,509,794,457</td>
<td>47,167,283,674</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of the liquidity risk during the year using Cashbook balances could not be undertaken due to Management weaknesses in carrying out monthly bank reconciliations; therefore the running balances in the Cashbooks did not reflect the true cash position.
Recommendations

The University should:

(1) in the short to medium term, strive to improve its liquidity position starting with improved cash management practices and better resource allocation at the time of budgeting.

(2) in the long term, look at improving cash inflows given the many opportunities available at her disposal.

7.9.5 Risks Associated with University Land

Makerere University has various pieces of land scattered across the country however; a number of them have ownership challenges, such as: encroachment, lack of title deeds, expired leases, and disputes all of which affect development of University land. The following matters were noted during the audit:

7.9.5.1 Untitled Land

It was noted that the University Management had not secured titles for the following pieces of land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/no</th>
<th>Location of the Land</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kagugube Hill (Part of land occupied by School of Law)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Land occupied by School of Law. (No lease from Buganda Land Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land at Kasangati located along Gayaza road before Kasangati Health Centre</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>The Land is utilised by the School of Public Health and is untitled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Buyana farmland located in Mpigi</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Partly used as farm land, for Staff housing, and as a forest reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land at Kibaale</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Used as a forest reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a risk that the University can lose this land to encroachers if it remains untitled.

Recommendation

Management should prioritise the process of acquisition of the Certificates of title for all University land.

7.9.5.2 Encroachment of University Land

It was noted that the ownership of the land in Katanga, Bwaise, Makindye, and Kabanyolo is threatened by encroachment that has resulted into court cases between Makerere University and the various encroachers. The likely cause of the encroachment is delayed occupancy and development on the land. Refer to Table 7.9.5-2below for details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Location of the land</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katanga along North Kitante road</td>
<td>1-47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>There are squatters on the University land and there is an ongoing court case against the squatters. The land is not developed by the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Makindye land located on Lukuli hill</td>
<td>14, 45 and 57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Court cases against and by the encroachers on the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kabanyolo land located in Wakiso district after Gayaza Trading Centre</td>
<td>67, 85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Court case against the University for the vacant possession of land since 1968 as part of Kabanyolo farm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Land at Katalemwa along Gayaza road after Mpererwe Trading Centre**
   - Approximately 31 acres
   - There is encroachment towards Mpererwe Trading Centre.

5. **Bwaise near the Northern Bypass**
   - Approximately 4.95 acres
   - Titled but encroached on. Ongoing case by the University against the encroacher

**Recommendation**

Management should follow up pending cases before Courts of Law and consider making plans for the development of vacant land after disposition by Court of the pending land disputes in order to prevent further encroachment.

**7.9.5.3 Vacant and Undeveloped University Land**

The University has prime pieces of land which have not been developed. These include the following:

1. The Land at Buyana located in Mpigi - approximately 322 acres. A portion of the land is used as farm land, for staff housing and partly as a forest reserve, but most of the land is vacant and undeveloped.

2. Land at Makindye comprised in plots 14, 45 and 57 - approximately 14 acres; where a small portion of the land is used for a residential commercial structure, while the rest of the land is vacant and undeveloped.

The presence of undeveloped land exposes the plots to encroachment.

**Recommendations**

The University Management should ensure that:

1. all title deeds to the land are caveated

2. explore ways of establishing physical presence, e.g. by way of fencing off such land or even appointing caretakers in the short term as the University plans to have this land developed in the long term.

**7.10 UNIVERSITY INVESTMENTS, INNOVATIONS AND FUNDING MODEL**

**7.10.1 University Investments**

In the 1970’s, Makerere University Council established service units to provide the University with essential services. In 1990, Council decided to make some Units operate commercially by generating profits, hence the term Commercial Units. Council’s decision at the time was guided by the various business opportunities in each of the Unit’s industry coupled with the need to diversify the University’s sources of income. This was intended to bring in additional income to the University by the Commercial Units paying 10% of their profits. The Units included Makerere University Printery, Maize Mill, Bakery, Makerere University Guest House, University Bookshop and Makerere University Building Unit Limited, which came on board later in 1998. The Units were registered with the Registrar of Business Names under the Companies Act. Many of the Units underperformed and did not remit any share of the profits to Council, and as a result most Units were closed.

The University came up with an Investment Policy and Work Plan in 2006, but this was never implemented. Currently, the University has registered an Investment Holding Company, which is managing all the business units under a common umbrella. The following additional observations were noted;
7.10.1.1 The 2006 Investment Strategy

Following the enactment of the Investment Policy in 2006, the University Council appointed a Select Committee which was responsible for selecting investment choices for the University land. The Committee was tasked to put forth a proposal for identifying capital investments and service providing facilities which should be located on different selected plots of the University land. The investments were to be operated on a ‘Build Operate and Transfer’ (BoT) arrangement. The Committee proposed the following investment initiatives;

Table 7.10.1-1: Proposed Investments by the Select Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Size - Acres</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bwaise Junior Quarters</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Shopping Mall, Blocks of modern flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Charles - Kololo</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>First Class Apartments similar to Golf Course Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekobo Avenue</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Block of Flats (1st. class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katalemwa</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>Housing Estate, Bungalows and Flats on high ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makindye</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>5 Star Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, all these initiatives were never implemented due to the following reasons:

(1) **Delayed Operationalization of the Investment Advisory Committee**

The University Council recommended the establishment of the Investment Advisory Committee that would work as a Technical Committee of Council on investment to steer the investment process in the Investment Policy of 2006. However, the operationalisation of the Investment Advisory Committee was delayed for 3 years until April 2009.

(2) **Bureaucracy in decision making of the Proposed Investments**

Proposals were developed by the Investment Advisory Committee, passed on to the Finance, Planning and Administration Committee for discussion and eventually to the Council for approval. The levels of discussions and approvals were many and took time for the final investment decisions to be made. It was necessary to strengthen the Investment Advisory Committee with adequate experienced members to enable them make substantiated proposals and report their decisions directly to Council for consideration.

(3) **Lack of Funds to Develop/Implement the Proposed Investments**

Investment proposals like Makerere University Commercial Plaza, Residential apartments and a 5 star hotel were developed but the sourcing of funds remained a challenge. Various options like BOT, PPP, Joint Ventures and getting bank loans against land titles as security at a cheaper rate were proposed but could not be secured because of various challenges including absence of clear guiding laws on PPP at the time and lack of separate titles for particular land allocated for development to act as security.

(4) **Challenges on Land Ownership**

Most of the University land was not surveyed with boundaries opened, while some land was heavily encroached on with a lot of disputes that hindered any development decisions thereon. Land titles for some properties were very old, some were acquired as far back as 1939 when the University was still known as a College; thus needed to update the titles to reflect the right ownership.
(5) Shift in Investment Strategy - University Investment Platforms

In 2014, the University Council established and registered two companies namely Makerere University Holdings Company and Makerere University Endowment Fund to be responsible for management of commercial and financial investments, respectively. Accordingly, all the existing commercial entities and the newly established ones were to be managed by Makerere Holdings Company. The financial investments under Crown Agents in UK and the local fund to be established, were to be managed under Makerere Endowment Fund. The specific investment objectives of the two companies included the following:

**Mak Holdings:** Mak Holdings was established with the following objectives:

- To act as an entrepreneur on behalf of Makerere University, identify new areas of economic investment and to undertake such investments in a manner not prejudicial to the Company’s interest and furthers Makerere University’s developments;
- To develop University Business Units by initiating, coordinating, developing, promoting and managing University’s existing commercial units and business ventures for the benefit of the University;
- To acquire and lease property;
- To acquire businesses/companies;
- To improve, develop and manage property; and
- To acquire know-how; among others.

**Mak Endowment Fund:** On the other hand, Mak Endowment Fund was established with the following objectives:

- To receive and mobilise funds for the benefit of Makerere University;
- To invest the funds held by the Fund in an economical manner for the benefit of the University; and
- To make annual budgetary contributions towards the funding of scholarships, research, infrastructure, teaching and learning materials, staff remunerations, among other activities that enable to achieve the University’s core mandate.

From the above, it can be seen that the specific objectives of the two investment vehicles are in tandem with the overall University objectives in terms of enhancing University revenue so as to modernise existing facilities, introduce new ones, fund research activities, and improve the general service provision at the University.

7.10.1.2 Performance of the New Investment Companies

I. Makerere University Holding Company (Mak Holdings)

Mak Holdings undertook a diagnostic study to evaluate the financial health of the existing commercial entities and their future prospects and determine potential commercial investments that can be established to enhance resource mobilisation to economically benefit the University. It came up with a number of proposals as presented below:

1. **Proposed Real Estate Investment Projects**

Mak Holdings procured the services of ENS Africa to undertake transactional advisory services for the flagship of real estate investment projects as shown in Table 7.10.1-2 below. ENS Africa came up with an investment plan which was approved by the Board of Mak Holdings but is yet to be approved by the Investment Advisory Committee and the University.
Council. The implementation phase for the proposed investment plan is slated for December 2017.

Table 7.10.1-2: Flagship Real Estate Investment Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Value (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kololo</td>
<td>Development Lease</td>
<td>Commercial (Business Park)</td>
<td>105M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-Star Hotel (350 keys)</td>
<td>70M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luxury Apartments</td>
<td>19M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Campus</td>
<td>Design Finance Build Operate &amp; Transfer (DFBOT)</td>
<td>3-Star Hotel (150 Keys)</td>
<td>18M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000-Seater Convention Centre</td>
<td>16.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Accommodation 16000 beds</td>
<td>116M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Centre</td>
<td>20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makindye</td>
<td>Development Lease</td>
<td>Middle Income Housing (Gated)</td>
<td>26M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objectives of the projects are to enable Makerere University realise value from underutilised and/or unoccupied land and thereby improve her financial position through commercial developments of such land. The projects will also enable the University to provide hotel and conference facilities to both the general public and the University staff with a view to enhancing the University infrastructure, revenue generation, and service delivery.

(2) Commercialisation of the Existing Commercial Units

Mak Holding’s mandate requires takeover of all existing University commercial entities to enable them create more value, facilitate business growth and generate more profits. A diagnostic study to assess the existing commercial units to establish their viability for possible takeover by Mak Holdings was done in 2015. As mandated by Council, the Guest House was consequently transferred to MaK Holdings on 1st February, 2016 without any liability. However the Printery has not yet been transferred to the Holding Company despite the Council resolution.

A comparison of performance of the Guest House for eleven months (February to December 2016) under the Holding Company with the preceding 11 months before take over indicated an improvement in sales from UGX.400m to UGX.1.1bn and profits from UGX.23m to UGX.229m. However, despite the improved performance, the Guest House risks being run down as it is singly shouldering the expenditure of the of Mak Holdings. Last year alone, it paid UGX.121m to the CEO of Mak Holdings as salary.

(3) Establishment of New University Businesses

The business diagnostic report highlighted the need for revival as well as establishment of the new entities which included the following:

(i) Revival of the University Bakery
(ii) Establishment of a memorabilia Shop
(iii) Introduction of Executive/Professional Training Programmes to target executives and senior professionals in organisations, by organising short courses which are managed on a business model outside of the regular academic setting blending both the academic and professional aspects.
(iv) Takeover of the Centre for Languages and Communication Services (CLCS).
(v) Establishment of the University Graduation Unit by managing graduations of Makerere and other Universities.
(vi) Establishment of a University Consulting Unit. This however needed development of a Consulting Policy which needed facilitation in terms of funding.

All the above proposals need both human and financial resources which have not been provided to the Holding Company. Therefore, apart from takeover of the guest house, no implementation has taken place in the last two years.

(4) Closed Commercial Units

Council as the governing body of the University takes decisions on closure of the inactive commercial units; however, normal closure procedures were never followed.

The Bakery, Maize mill and Building unit became inactive and Council decided to discontinue their operations. The University did not carry out closure audits to establish the status of the assets and liabilities at the time of closure. Relatedly, the Guest house was handed over to Mak Holdings Limited in February, 2014 without a formal handover/take over report, save for the due diligence valuation report by the three-man team appointed by Council.

The closed Bakery and Maize mill are under lock and key under the supervision of the Dean of Students.

Recommendation

To avoid continued security cost and loss of value of the assets, the University should establish the value of the assets and hand them over to the Holding company for possible business revival or proper dissolution.

II. Makerere University Endowment Fund (MakEF)

The Mak University Endowment Fund (MakEF) manages the financial investments of the University and is governed by the Board of Trustees (BOT). The BOT procured the services of M/s Gen Africa Limited, as the local Fund manager, and M/s. Crown Agents Investment Management Limited (CAIML), as the Off-Shore Fund Manager. The Committee noted the following:

(1) Local Fund

The Mak Endowment Fund operates two collection bank accounts in STANBIC and DFCU banks. The funds collected are transferred to Standard Chartered Bank which is the Custodian of the Fund, and managed by M/s Gen Africa Limited.

To support the growth of the fund, the University Council came up with the regulation for all University students and its affiliate institutions to pay UGX.10, 000 pa, and other University founded Schools like Makerere College School, Makerere Primary School and the Child Study Centre to pay UGX.3, 000 and 2, 000 respectively per term, with effect from financial year 2014/2015. By December 2016, UGX.182, 400, 000 had been collected from institutions, and UGX.32m was collected from pledges. By close of December 2016, UGX.214, 400, 000 had been received.

(2) Local Fund Investment

It was noted that UGX.80m was invested on a fixed deposit account for a period 27/06/2016 to 18/07/2016 and fetched a net of UGX.503, 013 in interest. By 20/09/2016, UGX.80,474,256 was re-invested in treasury bills with the expected market value of UGX.83,160,538 (Capital + Interest) upon maturity, while UGX.90,000,000 was transferred to the custodian account in February 2017 and had not been invested at the time of writing.
this Report. Had it been transferred to the custodian account in time, it would have been invested to earn more interest for the Fund’s growth.

(3) Offshore Investments

Makerere University has a fund with CAIML in the United Kingdom (UK) which came into existence from donations of various philanthropists during the colonial rule in the 1930’s. Donors included Leaders of Church Missionary Societies and European Clergymen, Former Colonial Masters in East Africa, Foreign Educationalists and Former Lecturers of Institutions of Higher Learning. The Investment Fund that is managed by Crown Agents Investment Management Limited was envisioned to be the seed fund for the Makerere Endowment Fund. The value of the fund as at 30/06/2016 stood at GBP.1, 043, 411.50.

It was also noted that between 2001 and 2008 the University withdrew a total of USD1, 969,760 (GBP1, 120, 000) from the Fund during the period 2000 to 2008 as shown below:

Table 7.10.1-2: Withdrawal of USD1, 969,760 by Makerere University Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Amount in GBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/12/2001</td>
<td>Payment to Standard Chartered Bank Kla</td>
<td>291,500</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2004</td>
<td>Payment to Standard Chartered Bank Kla</td>
<td>884,750</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/2005</td>
<td>Payment to Standard Chartered Bank Kla</td>
<td>543,510</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/06/2008</td>
<td>Payment to Standard Chartered Bank Kla</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,969,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,120,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.10.1-3: Breakdown of Utilisation of the Withdrawn Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/11/2001</td>
<td>291,500</td>
<td>Buying equipment for Physics, Soil Science, Vet and Chemistry Departments as approved by Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2004</td>
<td>884,750</td>
<td>Reimburse Faculties’ accounts for the borrowed funds to extensively rehabilitate the University Plant (Main Campus)- 95th Council Meeting held on 1-2nd October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/2005</td>
<td>543,510</td>
<td>M/s. Arab Contractors certificate No 4 &amp; 5; Completion of Library extension. 101st Council Meeting held on 24th March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/06/2008</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>No details on file; No purpose provided; No Council Minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,969,760</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted from the above table, the Committee was not provided with documentation indicating how GBP.250, 000 was utilised.

7.10.1.3 Challenges faced by the Investment Companies

During the audit, the following challenges were identified;

(1) Lack of Funding for the Two Investment Companies

The University is supposed to fund the investment companies for the initial three years with operational funding to kick-start the implementation of their objectives. Although the investment vehicles came up with the following budgets for the initial three years (*Table 7.10.1-4*); these budgets were not financed:

Table 7.10.1-4: Budget Requirements for the Investment Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mak Holdings</td>
<td>425,200,000</td>
<td>278,900,000</td>
<td>289,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UGX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund</td>
<td>187,700,000</td>
<td>176,525,000</td>
<td>182,431,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UGX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, a review of the budgets indicated that they were all consumptive in nature and may not adequately help kick start the desired projects.

As a result of lack of funding, the Holding Company has resorted to “borrowing” from the Guest House to pay facilitation for the Ag. CEO as mentioned above. Lack of funding has also delayed the establishment of proposed quick wins, especially with the new cash-cow investments, such as: the memorabilia shop, graduation management business unit and takeover of the Centre for Languages and Communication Services.

The Fund’s operations are curtailed and the Funds administrator has gone unpaid since April 2016. Lack of funding will frustrate the efforts of the Companies to steer the diversification and growth of the investments.

(2) Delayed Transfer of University Commercial Units to the Holding company

The Holding Company was to act as an entrepreneur on behalf of Makerere University, develop University Business Units, acquire and lease property, and acquire new businesses/companies, among other things. The University was to initially transfer all commercial units to the Company. To-date, two years after the creation of Makerere Holdings Limited, the University has only handed over management of the Guest House. The rest of the commercial units like the Printery are yet to be handed over. Delays to hand over the commercial units to the Holding Company impacts on the timely achievement of the objectives for which the Holdings Company was created.

During the audit, the team was not provided with any satisfactory reason as to why the other Units especially the Printery have not been handed over.

(3) Inadequate Staffing

The proposed management structures of the Companies are not filled due to lack of salaries and operational funds. As such, resource mobilisation efforts are frustrated. The Companies are each run by one unpaid Staff member who cannot single-handedly achieve their mandate.

(4) Poor and Delayed Remittances to the Endowment Fund

The University continues to show no commitment in remitting the Endowment Fund fee from the University and Affiliate Institutions’ students on time, thus affecting the growth of the local fund. In the academic year 2014/2015, remittances from the University Students and Affiliate Institutions were not made to the Fund, while remittance from Makerere College School for Term 3 of 2015 had not been received. For Makerere Primary School, no remittance was been made at all.

(5) Lack of Data of the Number on Students

Makerere University founded schools like Makerere College School and the Child Study Centre remitted block figures of fund fees without evidence of the number of Students they have on ground. There could be a possibility of under reporting.

(6) Lack of Specific Guidelines for Transfer of Collections to the Custodian

The Endowment Fund had no specific guidelines in place to direct the transfer of the funds from the collection account to the Custodian account. By the time of this audit, UGX.90,000,000 had just been transferred to the Custodian account for investment after lying idle for more than 2 months.

(7) Lack of a Business Culture and Bureaucracies in Decision Making

There was still a lack of a business culture and bureaucracy in making business decisions. Though this was a major challenge to the growth of the University Investments, care has to
be exercised to avoid excessive risk taking and loss of University assets to unscrupulous individuals. In the face of these daunting challenges, the efforts of the new investment vehicles may go to waste just like the earlier efforts. There is need for a more aggressive approach towards implementation of the new investment plan with prioritisation of its funding.

**Recommendations**

The University should:

1. follow through with its commitment to fund the operations of the Companies for at least three years to enable them take off to achieve their intended objectives. Adequate funding would also enable the companies to recruit sufficient Staff to smoothly run them.

2. ensure that all remittances to the Endowment Fund are timely.

3. support the Endowment Fund to establish the number of Students in the University-founded Schools.

4. transfer all Commercial Units to Mak Holdings as resolved by Council, without further delay.

5. ensure that the Board of Trustees develops guidelines as to when the funds accumulated on the collection accounts should be transferred to the Custodian account. This would enable timely investments of the funds by the Fund Manager.

**7.10.2 Innovations and Intellectual Property Rights**

Makerere University has the highest concentration of academic talent in the country. Several of the academic staff and students undertake research, consultancies and other problem-based initiatives at national and international levels. The University developed a Research and Innovations Policy in 2008, which is majorly centred on developing, coordinating, strengthening and management of research. The innovation docket was however not adequately catered for, other than mention of rewards to innovators; and it was also not clear on how it would be done and managed. The Policy provides for The Makerere University Board of Research and Publications under the secretariat of the Director of the School of Graduate Studies to guide the Research and Innovation function of the University. The following additional observations were made during the audit:

**7.10.2.1 Development of University Innovations**

As highlighted in Chapter 5, subsection 5.6, research, consultancies and other problem-based initiatives undertaken at the University were largely individual initiatives, with most of them not being fully developed. These have therefore not filtered into financial benefit for the University and the country as whole. Funding of research was solely in the hands of development partners/donors, but was not adequate to transform such innovations into market-ready products.

While some of the innovations like the Kiira Motor Project, MV Mulimi, iLabs, MakaPads, Low cost irrigation system, ARMS Project, etc., have been developed to commercial level with the help of the Presidential Initiative on S&T support, others have not been moved forward, beyond the respective Colleges where such ideas were developed. It was explained that resource constraints have limited the development of potential innovation and subsequent commercialisation of the few breakthroughs.
In 2014, Makerere Holding Company was established to provide a structure which facilitates development, growth and effective management of all University innovations and businesses; and to mobilise, receive and invest funds to contribute towards the funding of research and infrastructure, among other activities. However, as indicated above, this had not yet taken off as the Company was still struggling with management and funding challenges.

Further noted was that the Research and Innovations Policy provides for the “Makerere University Board of Research and Publications” to guide the research and innovation function of the University. However, this was yet to be put in place. In addition, the Policy provides for rewards to innovators (both Staff and Students) to encourage innovations. However, details to operationalise this provision have never been put in place.

Under the circumstances, development of new ideas was still a challenge as it was neither well-funded nor well-structured.

### 7.10.2.2 Patenting of Commercially Viable Innovations

Most research conducted at Makerere University had generated limited commercial interest and yet universities have a high potential of contributing to the country’s industrial and economic development. The University had no proper structure to identify, support, patent, and manage the innovations for commercialisation purposes. Individual researchers and innovators (Staff and Students), despite using University resources to develop their ideas, had patented their innovations under their individual names. The University has not economically benefited from such innovations, save for the Kiira EV Project where the University has a 4% shareholding in the ensuing commercial Company created, Kiira Motors Corporation. (The remaining 96% of the shares in the commercial company are owned by the Uganda Development Corporation, an investment institution owned solely by the Government of Uganda).

As such, the commercialisation of the University products has not been streamlined, leaving gaps for innovators to individually benefit from sales of some products. For instance, the irrigation pumps developed using the Presidential Initiative on S&T support and the Academic results management system were sold to third parties, but the University did not realise any income from such sales. There was absence of a clear policy on patenting and commercialising of the innovations of the University.

### Recommendations

1. Government is advised to expand research support to the University, so as to enhance the University’s capacity to undertake research which will positively contribute to the industrial and economic development of the country at large.

2. To further improve funding for Research and Innovations, the University should consolidate efforts to solicit research funds from national and international organisations, both public and private; and engage the private sector to contribute towards Research and Innovations through contract research and sponsoring of research chairs, joint ventures, licensing, patents and trademarks.

3. The University should develop a clear policy and mechanisms to guide the management of intellectual property and commercialisation of University innovations.

4. Makerere Holdings Company should be empowered to take charge of its role to identify and further develop potential innovations into good and profitable investments to contribute towards University’s goals and objectives.
Government should consider setting up well-facilitated technology parks where innovations can be nurtured to grow into products that will benefit the local population in Uganda and have financial offshoots for the University.

7.10.3 Funding Models for Higher Education: Lessons for Makerere University

Several analysts have noted that higher education in Uganda receives somewhat less than 10% of the overall education budget, or just a little under 0.5% of GDP. Even among developing countries, these figures are on the lower side. The dynamic of the debate on public funding of universities has for several years been framed by the issue of “unit costs” or “average per student costs” – the idea apparently being that if institutions recover the unit cost irrespective of who covers the costs then the Higher Education System would be more competitive and sustainable.

Tuition revenues are the single largest source of income, accounting for roughly half of all revenues in public universities and close to 100% of revenues at private institutions. Proponents of higher payments by students have made two arguments; one based on need, and the other based on comparative costs. The first argument is that current levels of fees have been insufficient to fund high-cost programmes in science and technology and that higher fees are required for the delivery of such programmes. The second argument is that fees in universities are not much higher than fees in better-quality secondary schools and much less than in certain comparable developing-world countries and hence Students should be able to afford more. This discussion is usually accompanied by an acknowledgement that fees are in fact quite high compared to average national income, but also with an assurance that implementation of a proper student loan scheme would address the ingredient challenges.

It was also noted that while the number of public universities is increasing, the funding is not enhanced to match the increased demand. Under the current circumstances the Higher Education Funding Model is unsustainable.

Recommendations

Management is advised to implement a diversified funding model premised on international best practices so as to make Makerere University financially sustainable. The funding model for Makerere University should take into account the following sources of revenue:

7.10.3.1 Enhancement of University Investment Income

This can be achieved by:

(1) Investment in Housing

Makerere University has adequate land in prime areas of Kololo, Makindye and Makerere University Hill that can support the development of low to upper income housing units. Project Economics for 10 self-contained housing units developed outside Kampala city outskirts at a cost of US $2 million would pay back in 9 years with a rate of return of 8%. This project can be financed by a low interest loan or through a Public Private Partnership model of Build, Operate and Transfer (BOT). Real Estate Development is a major source of investment income for Universities in the UK, the US and South Africa and contributes between 10%-30% of total University operating revenue. Management is advised to operationalise the recommendation by the Omaswa Report (2014) and McGregor Report (2007) regarding land development.

(2) Investment in other University Properties

Makerere University Printery, Book Shop, Guest House, Halls of Residence, and the University Hospital have the potential to generate significant revenue for Makerere Revenue
if these business units are operated on a commercial/profit basis. For these to succeed, Makerere should use the Makerere University Holdings Company as a business arm to manage these investments. The University Business arm should run these assets on a commercial basis as is the case in Universities in Ghana, University of Dar es Salaam and the United States.

7.10.3.2 Operationalisation of Endowment Funds

Endowment funds are major sources of funding for Universities in Europe, North America, Australia and South Africa. For example, Harvard has an endowment of $37.6 billion, Oxford (£4.78 billion), University of South Africa (R 4,925 million), and the University of Cape Town (U.S $300 million). Endowment Funds have enabled ground breaking research and innovation, the development of modern infrastructure, purchase of modern equipment and provided scholarships for undergraduate and postgraduate studies. Makerere University has taken modest steps in implementing a recommendation by the Omaswa Taskforce in regards to Endowment Funds, the Makerere Run to Raise Funds for the Students’ Centre.

The Makerere University Endowment Fund (MUEF) could be funded by the following sources:

1. **Fundraising**: Fundraising/philanthropy is a major source of funding for Universities in the UK, US and South Africa. A fundraising unit composed of competent or technical personnel should be set up in the Office of the Vice Chancellor who would equally participate in the leadership role to raise money for the University.

2. **Donations and Gifts** from University Alumni, Diaspora, friends of Makerere and other organisations are major sources of endowment income. At the national level, countries including Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya and Senegal have established their own Diaspora organisations to promote national development including higher education. Management is advised to put in place a Directorate/Department for University Alumni and International Relations in the Office of the Vice Chancellor which shall be responsible for mobilising fundraising income, gifts and donations to Makerere University.

3. **Grants**: The University Grant Policy states that 15% of each grant received should be remitted to the University. The Endowment Fund could be supplemented by these grant funds and these could be utilised to fund research, scholarship awards for specialised studies, and development of infrastructure, among others.

4. **Working with the Private Sector to generate Income from Sale of Goods and Service**: Private sector resource mobilisation has been successful for South African Universities. For example, 55 percent of research in South Africa takes place in the business sector and only 20 percent happens in the universities (HESA 2012) which is a sharp contrast to the rest of Africa. Management is advised to work with the Private Sector to generate income through the sale of industrial research outputs, innovation, and other goods and services which enhance the performance of medium and large scale industries. Revitalisation of the Makerere University Private Sector Forum comprised of successful business executives (entrepreneurs) and industrialists would be an ideal starting point to market University niches in the region.

5. **Funding from Development Partner and Networks**: International Agencies including: Carnegie, Rockefeller Foundation, and the Scandinavian (Sweden and Norway) partner states are major sources of funding for research, scholarships and programmes for national development. SIDA and NORAD have led by example in supporting higher education and national development in Tanzania and Ethiopia.
Makerere University should appoint a resource mobilisation and partnership adviser who should work closely with the Vice Chancellor to strengthen the collaboration between the University and international agencies that have long supported Higher Education in Africa.

7.10.3.3 Government Subvention using a Performance Contract

A performance contract (or result based financing model) is a funding model which has been implemented successfully in public universities in Senegal, Dar es Salaam, Ghana and the United States. In this funding model, Government undertakes to disburse a predetermined amount (Government subvention) and higher education institutions agree to deliver stated goals/priorities. Universities compete for these funds and the efficiency gains stimulate the evolution of Centres of Excellence in fields such as IT, Mathematics, Medicine, and Technology which attracts further funding from Government and Development Partners (e.g. the World Bank and the European Union).

7.10.3.4 Recovery of the Unit Cost of Education

The University should recover the unit cost of education by having the fees payable being pegged at an appropriate level. Where it is clear that there is no absolute definition of the term “cost”, it is generally acceptable to define it as the measure in Uganda shillings, of institutional resources used in the process of providing institutional outputs during a given time period (Auditor General Report – Unit Cost Study of Education at Public Universities in Uganda – May 2010).

In the Auditor General’s Report, the actual unit cost per student was captured as UGX 10.2 Million per year in the Faculty of Medicine and was least at UGX 3.8 Million per year under the Institute of Adult and Continuing Education.

7.10.3.5 Increased Higher Education Funding through the Student Loan Scheme

The Student Loan Scheme has been successful in increasing access to Higher Education in Kenya especially for qualified students from needy families and for reducing overreliance on Government. Student loan schemes exist in Ghana, South Africa, Rwanda and Tanzania. Makerere University with the support of the Higher Education Student Financing Board (HESFB) should prioritise increasing enrolment of students who are funded by the loan scheme. The success of the student loan scheme is hinged on addressing issues of equity and efficiency of funding, enhancing cost recovery and resource mobilisation from other sources other than government.

Management is advised to lobby for more funding through the student loan scheme. The loan should constitute a contract with the Student conditioned on not participating in any strike during studentship or risk termination of the loan with penalty.
CHAPTER EIGHT: UTILISATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge unlike raw materials can be used multiple times without depreciated value, and unlike equipment it can be used by many people at the same time; and can also be shared widely at minimal cost. Knowledge creation and innovation depend heavily on high-quality education and a well-developed information infrastructure. There has been an unprecedented growth in the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in teaching, research and extension activities. ICT projects using a range of technologies, including computers, digital cameras, handheld devices, television, and radio, have demonstrated their value in several areas of need such as health, agriculture, and, of course, education. ICT capabilities support a model of education in which knowledge creation and learning how to learn are both processes and goals. ICT constitutes a topic of growing importance for public policies, notably in the field of education. The capacity of ICT to build borderless networks represents possibilities for innovative peer learning across territories and countries. In addition to redefining access to knowledge and instructional design and provision, the penetration of ICT in all dimensions of economic, social and cultural activities has far-reaching implications in terms of the skills required to become an active member of society. The ability of students to utilise ICT has become a new requirement for effective education systems. ICTs are contributing to building new relationships between schools and their communities, and to bridging the gap between formal, non-formal and informal education.

The future of ICT in higher education will be shaped by the degree to which higher education institutions can:

1. Adopt new sourcing options and management practices to simplify management of commodity IT infrastructure, platforms, applications, and services and to increase their agility and ability to innovate.

2. Embrace mobile technologies and deliver applications and experiences as engaging and effective as consumer providers.

3. Apply analytics to improve student success and institutional productivity and efficiency.

4. Enhance and expand research computing and digital scholarship technologies and services to remain competitive in a global marketplace.

5. Use technology to improve pedagogy and develop entirely new forms of teaching and learning that can educate diverse students cost effectively, at massive scale and distance, and innovatively.

6. Use technology to enter new marketplaces and support new business models.

7. Determine how to leverage the Internet of Things as effectively as other industries.

8. Protect data security and individuals’ privacy without impeding academic openness and collaboration.

9. Prepare and engage faculty to espouse and adopt, rather than resist and impede, the present and coming changes (EDUCAUSE).
Makerere University is the oldest largest public University in Uganda with international acclaim offering several study, research & innovation, and knowledge transfer partnerships (KTPs) and networking programmes in several disciplines hosted by 10 Colleges. The use of ICT for teaching, learning, research, KTPs & networking; and business processes support is part of the University’s strategy for the medium and long-term agenda to enhance its status as a research-led University. Having set up the ICT backbone infrastructure over a decade ago, the demands of University education at the moment have superseded the level of preparedness by the University to deliver its mandate facilitated by the available ICT infrastructure. Over the years, maintenance of hardware and acquisition of up to-date software licenses has been a challenge that has in most instances resulted into ICT systems running into obsolescence. This, in effect, has had a denting impact on the quality of teaching, research and related administrative processes top of which have been allegations of malfeasance in financial, human resource and academic records management.

The Visitation Committee on Makerere University 2016, against this background undertook to assess the utilisation of ICT in enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of business processes including but not limited to admission, registration, results management, academic records management, Human Resources, Financial Management, registry, decision support and business intelligence, assets and inventory management, communication and stakeholder engagement.

The method of work adopted included consultative meetings with officials at multiple levels of the University’s administration hierarchy. Consultative sessions were held with Management of the 10 Colleges including the Principals, Deputy Principals, Academic Registrar, Bursar, Department Heads, Office of the Accountant General – MOFPED, among other staff. Visits to computer laboratories and server rooms at the respective Colleges for assessment of the physical environment, hardware and security were carried out. The Committee also made visits to the offices of Lecturers to assess usage of ICTs in preparation of teaching and research material; and to administrative units to assess the usage of ICT in their respective functions of the University. These visits and consultative meetings were enhanced by review of related literature including reports by previous Committees, and benchmarking within Uganda (IUIU, Kyambogo University and Mbarara University of Science and Technology) and abroad. The key findings and associated recommendations are presented in this Chapter.

**8.2 ICT IMPERATIVES IN STRATEGIC PLANS**

**8.2.1 Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015**

This Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015 was structured around six themes: Higher Education Curriculum Reform; Increasing ICT Capacity; Increasing Access, Equity and Coverage; Delivery of Quality Higher Education; Financing Higher Education; and Improving Governance of Higher Education. The key aspects of Human Resource Managements were covered in Thematic Areas 4 & 6: Delivery of Quality Higher Education and Improving Governance of Higher Education, respectively.

The Plan outlines that, “Information and communications technologies are fast revolutionising the delivery and quality of higher education. Generally ICT have become the major medium of teaching and learning in higher education. Every credible tertiary education institution must employ ICT to deliver quality higher education. Citing that, through electronic learning (e-learning), one lecturer can attend to thousands of students spread across a number of universities using high-speed electronic networks and multimedia
technologies. The Internet has become an indispensable, inexhaustible sharable resource for many students and lecturers alike. Virtual universities are now a burgeoning reality”.

The following is further noted in the Plan: “Higher education institutions should also take advantage of the government plans to extend Internet services to every district by 2003 and to provide telephone access to every sub-county in Uganda by 2005. The extension of these Internet and telephone services will no doubt create great opportunities for extending distance learning to district headquarters or community centres throughout the country. Therefore tertiary education institutions must coordinate and harmonise their ICT strategies with the overall national ICT plan”.

Vision 2025, the Government White Paper on Education (2008) and the Issues Paper recognise the importance of integrating ICTs in all aspects of Uganda’s Higher Education. It is also noted in the Higher Education Strategic Plan 2003-2015: “the integration of ICT in all operations of tertiary education institutions will enable these institutions to produce the skilled, efficient and relevant human resources to meet the needs and challenges of the emerging knowledge-based economy”.

The Strategic Plan points out that, the overall objective of this plan is to integrate ICTs into all the operations of tertiary education institutions to enable them to produce better skilled, more efficient and more relevant human resources to operate a sustainable knowledge-based economy in Uganda. The specific activities to realise the above objective are to:

1. Assist all tertiary institutions to develop rolling five year plans for integrating appropriate ICTs in their operations based on the higher education strategic plan.
2. Buy more ICT equipment to facilitate teaching and learning in tertiary education institutions. Specifically, it is proposed that all institutions aim at realising a ratio of 1 computer to 15 students by 2007 and a computer/student ratio of 1:5 by 2015.
3. Require every tertiary education student to pass approved ICT courses in order to graduate in his/her selected area of study by 2007.
4. Install and maintain appropriate ICTs in classrooms/lecture theatres in all institutions.
5. Construct adequate computer laboratory space for student use. The estimated space is about 8 square metres per student and a typical laboratory would have an average of 20 computers in it.
6. Set up Local Area Network for the various units that make up the institution. A typical Local Area network in this case has been assumed to comprise a server, about 10 computers, a Laser printer (High Speed), and switching/routing equipment.
7. Build a reliable infrastructure of networks, servers, storage and applications to support online courses and other new learning experiences. It is further recommended that intra-University communication be promoted through setting up of a Campus wide high-speed backbone through a Fibre Distributed Data Interface (FDDI) technology.
8. Minimise congestion in computer rooms by encouraging Students and Staff to own computer equipment through Government or individual institutions’ negotiated discounts or guaranteed loans for both Staff and Students purchases by 2007.
9. Develop teaching materials on compact discs for purchase by Students.
10. Support tertiary education institutions to acquire specialised ICTs appropriate for teaching and research.
(11) Train both academic and administrative staff in basic office automation applications; word processing, spreadsheets, databases, electronic mail and presentation software applications.


(13) Facilitate the upgrading of the current Education Management Information System to a more robust database management system (Oracle platform or its equivalent).

8.2.2 Makerere University Strategic Plan 2008/09-2018/19

The University’s 2008/9-2018/19 Strategic Plan considers consolidating an ICT-enabled environment among its key objectives in operationalising the support functions of the University. The following is observed in the Plan: “Information Communication Technology (ICT) revolution has radically changed the mode of acquiring, storing, transmitting, and applying knowledge; instructional processes and intellectual inquiry. ICT has now become a vehicle for teaching and learning, research, innovations and distance education delivery to the extent that universities can reach out to as many learners as possible in spite of spatial and temporal differences”. Several regional interventions were recognized in the Plan as follows:

(1) The East African Sub-marine System (EASSY); SEACOM [SEACOM 2008] would provide high capacity bandwidth linking businesses and communities in Southern and East Africa, Europe and South Asia;

(2) TEAMS which is between the Government of Kenya and the private sector; and Uhurunet which is a partnership of Governments and private sector from potentially 23 countries in the region under NEPAD umbrella offers Makerere University an opportunity to leverage the power of ICT. This would advance her ability not only to deliver an excellent learner-centred and research experience, but also extend her provision to different geographical settings at both national and international levels.

The Makerere University Strategic Plan outlines three (3) ICT strategic objectives:

(1) To enhance the quality and scope of ICT services in Makerere University by the end of 2013.

(2) To promote effective and appropriate utilisation of ICT resources by the end of 2013.

(3) To improve the electronic visibility of academic programmes in the University by the end of 2010.

8.2.3 Makerere University ICT Strategic Plan 2016-2021

The Makerere University ICT Strategic Plan 2016-2021 points to University-wide access to, and utilisation of ICT to enhance the position of Makerere University as a leader of academic excellence and Innovations, and its contribution to the sustainable development of society. The plan outlines the following strategic objectives:

(1) Enhance research and innovation using ICT as an Enabler;

(2) Integrate ICT within teaching and learning;

(3) Improve web management and engagement;

(4) Adopt University Administrative Information Systems;
(5) Build robust ICT digital infrastructure;

(6) Enhance Information Assurance; and

(7) Achieve efficient ICT Service Provision;

The authors of all these plans had a very good appreciation of the role of ICT in Higher Education. However, the Committee noted the missing linkage between the three strategic plans. There was no reference of the National Plan in the University Plan and the Directorate of Information and Communications Technology Support (DICTS) Plan. Furthermore, all the plans did not provide clear and well-costed work plans for the realisation of the prescribed objectives. Without costed work plans and associated resource flow plans, the Strategic Plan remained incomplete and did not offer decision makers a basis for prioritisation latter on implementation.

8.3 RECOMMENDATIONS BY PREVIOUS COMMITTEES

8.3.1 McGregor Visitation Committee 2006-2008

His Excellency Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, the President of the Republic of Uganda in His capacity as the Visitor to Public Universities appointed a 12 Member Visitation Committee to Public Universities in March 2006, chaired by Professor Gordon P. McGregor. The McGregor Committee was set up to visit, study and make a situational Analysis of Public Universities in Uganda (Makerere University, MUST, Kyambogo University and Gulu University); and make recommendations in respect of Administrative Affairs, Academic Affairs, Funding, Student Management and Public Private Sector Partnership. The McGregor Report was submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports in August 2007. This was followed by an associated White Paper in November 2008. The following are the recommendations related to utilisation of ICT in Higher Education and the associated Government position as well as implementation strategies for each proposal:

Recommendation I: Universities should create efficient and reliable management information systems to keep all stakeholders and data processing and retention be drastically improved. Staff including senior staff should be provided with I.C.T Training and to ensure effective planning and management, all University officials should be trained in the collection, storage and dissemination of data.

Government Position: Recommendation is accepted with an addition that Universities collect and utilise data.

Implementation Strategy: All Universities will be required to start ICT training programmes for staff. E-learning will be introduced and staff trained accordingly. The communication channel, such as the Makerere University web page will be upgraded and utilised by administrators to ease communication. The new Ministry of ICT should support institution efforts.

Recommendation II: Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performances. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible rewarded but poor performers should not be re-appointed. Terms of employment in public universities should change from permanent to pensionable to contracts of limited durations; say 3-5 years renewable on good performance.

Government Position: Recommendation was amended as follows: Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performances. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible rewarded but poor performers should not be re-
appointed. Academic staff in public Universities will be maintained on permanent and pensionable terms and appropriate criteria for their promotion will be put in place.

**Implementation Strategy:** Universities will be required to immediately review the human resource manual and implement the recommendation within short term of (1-2) years.

**Recommendation III:** Staff appraisal system should be universal, regular and effective with feedback. Students should be involved in the appraisal and assessment of academic staff and should have a right appeal against academic assessment.

**Government Position:** Recommendation was accepted.

**Implementation Strategy:** It will be implemented immediately and Government will require all Universities to develop and implement appraisal systems. Students and fellow staff will be part of the appraisal processes.

**Recommendation IV:** We commend the good progress Makerere has made in expanding ICT facilities and competence, and urge the institution to continue its good work in this area. All public universities should move rapidly to integrate in all teaching/learning, assessment and research.

**Government Position:** Recommendation was accepted.

**Implementation Strategy:** Government will solicit support from diverse sources and support development of I.C.T. Universities will set up consortiums to facilitate I.C.T. development and integration.

8.3.2 Omaswa Taskforce 2013-2014

The Omaswa Taskforce on Job Evaluation, Re-Organisation of the Staff Structure and Financing of Makerere University was setup by Makerere University Council on behalf of Government following Makerere University staff strike over salary related issues that took place in September 2011.

The recommendations of the Omaswa Taskforce related to the Utilisation of ICT in Higher Education are presented hereunder:

1. The University should aggressively embrace the use of ICTs in all its business processes. A dedicated programme should be implemented to raise awareness and to promote routine application of ICTs in all University units including the student community.


3. An establishment structure for the Directorate of Information and Communication Technology Support (DICTS) under the Office of the Vice-Chancellor should be developed to address current challenges and filled with appropriate staff with commensurate remuneration.

4. As knowledge generation Centres, Universities should take the lead in building an ICT culture in the country. In particular, Universities should begin to conduct paperless Council, Senate and other meetings which consume a lot of paper.

5. ICT should be given the priority it deserves in terms of funding, attention, etc.

6. Everything possible should be done to recruit and train ICT staff in the services of the University, including giving them special remuneration.
(7) The University must hook onto the new system (CEMAS) that the Ministry of Finance is developing for all Public Universities.

8.3.3 Kabaasa Committee 2013-2016

Makerere University Council in October 2015 reconstituted the Kabaasa Committee to review the financial situation of the University, in line with the implementation of the September 2013 Council decision that introduced a rationalised staff incentive as a stop-gap measure to address the staff welfare demands, arising out of the staff strike of August 2013. The Kabaasa Committee recommended several interventions. The following are the recommendations in respect of utilisation of ICT.

8.3.3.1 Strengthening the Revenue Unit

The Committee recommended that the revenue unit be strengthened through the following initiatives;

(1) Recruitment of ICT staff as earlier approved by Council to address the issues of: Billing – where proper bills are done for all students in the University and constantly checked for compliance.

(2) Systems audit, a specialised personnel to monitor what other users of the IT system are doing and to detect any fraud that may be attempted by some users from time to time. This has lacked in the University and is partly responsible for the alleged fraud.

(3) Data analysts who will possess specialised skills in managing large amounts of data and with competences in information technology and software development. The Committee noted that the accountant with no IT expertise may not easily handle data analysis.

8.3.3.2 Upgrade of MAK-PAY System

The Committee recommended that the MAK PAY system should be upgraded to cater for further Data analysis as is required by management. For instance, it should be able to separate tuition from other fees, indicate the College where the student belongs and any other reports that management may require.

8.3.3.3 Online Registration for All

The Committee recommended that online registration be enforced as earlier approved by Council. This was after realising that key activities depend on registration statistics. These activities include: Annual Budgeting; Fees Monitoring; Student Debtors Monitoring; Course Work Tests; Examinations, etc.

The recommendations of the previous Committee harmoniously assert the critical need for relevant and comprehensive information systems and related structures to support business process efficiency and effectiveness at Makerere University with special focus on Finance, Academics (Admission, Registration, Teaching & Learning, Results Management, and Academic Records Management) and Human Resource Management.

8.4 FINDINGS BY THE VISITATION COMMITTEE 2016/17

Makerere University has chronic challenges resulting from heavily human-supported systems. Consequently, during the Visitation, the Committee noted that Student and Staff numbers were not known; there were gross allegations of malfeasance in academic records management - missing and changing students’ marks; unreliable financial and human resource records; limited integration of IT in teaching and learning; obsolete and fragmented IT systems, among others. The University has a fibre backbone which with appropriate
maintenance seems to be working well, therefore focus was placed on information systems, pedagogical and research applications, data centre infrastructure and last-mile network infrastructure in the User Units.

More specifically, the Committee made the following observations relating to the University Wide Information Systems and the operations of DIC TS. These observations are made cognizant that protecting critical infrastructure and key resources is essential to the security, public health and safety, economic vitality, and way of life for the wider Makerere University community and stakeholders.

### 8.4.1 Key University Information Systems

The University has taken several initiatives to implement Information Systems (IS) for its Business Processes (BP) as enumerated in Table 8.4.1 below:

**Table 8.4.1: Summary of Key University Information Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrated Tertiary Software (ITS)</td>
<td>ITS is an ERP system that integrates the academic, human resource and finance functions of the University. ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning)</td>
<td>Not fully utilised. Lack of maintenance contract due to high maintenance costs coupled with no support contract, the University uses only a few modules that were working at the time of that decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CEMAS</td>
<td>An ERP System in progress to computerise most of the University’s core functions. Reform in expenditure. Emerging ERP SYSTEM for MAK.</td>
<td>Data migration and end-user platform compatibility issues. Implementation stalled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUELE</td>
<td>A learning platform designed to provide educators, administrators and learners with a single robust, secure and integrated system to create personalised learning environments.</td>
<td>Limited Storage and load balancing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Open Courseware (OCW)</td>
<td>To enable sharing of MIT course content for teaching and learning. These are available as text and audio-visual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MakIR</td>
<td>The official Institutional Repository (IR) of Makerere University.</td>
<td>Low content update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MakPay</td>
<td>A middleware to enable near real time online fees payments reconciliation with University Community</td>
<td>Generates a lot of work due to misplaced payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PaySlip</td>
<td>To generate staff payment slips.</td>
<td>Low usage by Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IEnabler</td>
<td>To enable student self-service for online registration, electronic payment records, viewing biodata, etc.</td>
<td>Does not handle graduate students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Virtua (makula)</td>
<td>For online library cataloguing.</td>
<td>Limited funds for sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sophos</td>
<td>University network antivirus systems centrally updated and managed.</td>
<td>Low Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Results Management System (RMS)</td>
<td>Home-grown Solution to ensure efficient students results entry and management. Used primarily by College Academic Registrar’s and AR Office</td>
<td>Lacks Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Webmail</td>
<td>To deliver efficient email communication across the entire University</td>
<td>Limited Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>VoIP</td>
<td>To enable voice over internet protocol communications</td>
<td>Limited Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4.2 Information Security Policy and Procedures

Makerere University has taken steps to develop several policies relating to Information security. These policies include:

1. Information and Communication Technology Policy (2016 - 2020)
2. Acceptable Use Of ICT Resources
3. Physical ICT Security Policy
4. Data Security
5. Web Content Publishing
6. Disposal Of ICT Equipment And Electronic Waste Management
8. Records Management Procedures;
9. Record Management Policy;
10. Information-flow Policy;
11. ICT Disaster Recovery Policy;

The development of the organisation’s Information Security Policy & Procedures is the first and most important step in developing an organisational ICT programme; therefore Makerere University is commended for this initiative. The policies developed lay the groundwork for securing the organisation’s ICT systems based on best practices with procedures defining how the organisation implements and operationalises the policy.

The Committee noted however, that the policies were not adequately enforced at Makerere University. There was also need to ensure that the policies and associated procedures spell out the information security aspects relating to third-parties such as suppliers of ICT equipment, systems, software and services.

8.4.3 ICT Physical and Environmental Security

Makerere University continued to experience burglary and theft of ICT Equipment (refer also to Subsection 5.4.9 of this Report). It was also observed that most of the server rooms at the University and computer labs did not meet the ICT physical and environmental Standard as recommended in ISO 27001. HVAC System was not functional, the facilities were not dust-proofed, cabling was not well done, and, there was absence of firefighting equipment and functional CCTV equipment in the labs, amongst other gaps.

Physical and environmental security encompasses protection of physical assets from damage, misuse, or theft. Physical security addresses the physical security mechanisms used to create secure areas around hardware. Physical access control, physical boundaries, and surveillance are examples of security practices used to ensure that only authorised personnel are allowed to access control system equipment. Environmental security addresses the safety of assets from damage from environmental concerns. ICT equipment can be very expensive and may ensure human safety; therefore, protection is important from fire, water, and other possible environmental threats.

Investment in the recommended ICT physical and environmental security to secure the investment in ICT equipment was noted to be minimal.
8.4.4 Systems and Services Acquisition, Development and Maintenance

Systems and services acquisition covers the contracting and acquiring of system components, software, and services from third parties. Streamlining the acquisition, in-house development and maintenance processes can go a long way in mitigating the ingredient risks associated with system integrity, configuration management, business continuity as well as systems compatibility. The Committee noted that there was fragmentation in procurement of ICT equipment, software and services. Units including Projects procured small qualities of similar equipment and software and in some cases devices like Apple Computers whose specifications are not necessary say for secretarial work.

8.4.4.1 Procurement of ICT Equipment, Systems & Software

The University would have better value for money in procurement of ICT equipment, software and systems if there was a centralised procurement effort to leverage the economies of scale in bargaining with vendors and service providers for efficient pricing and campus-wide Service Level Agreements on common equipment and productivity software.

8.4.4.2 In-House Development of Systems

The Committee noted several innovation initiatives across different Colleges and Units, for example, CEDAT, QAD, AR, DICTS, CHS, and COCIS to mention but a few. These initiatives are applaud-able and indeed provide a platform for idealising plausible solutions while enabling constructive pedagogy for talented scholars to apply themselves and develop meaningful skills for professional practice. However, such innovations had not been advanced and adopted into the mainstream operations of the University. The Results Management System developed by staff in the AR Department was alleged to have been abused by the developers due to lack of clear procedures for integrating systems developed in-house into University Business Processes. The Information Systems Innovation Hubs at Makerere University should otherwise with proper promotion and IP management be servicing the nation and region as key solutions incubators modeled against the popular Silicon Valley. The Committee noted use of pirated software at the University. Where free and open source software exists it should be explored otherwise only properly licensed software should be utilised at Makerere University at all times. The University should ensure that ICT system and services acquisition policy and procedures are consistent with applicable laws, directives, policies, regulations, standards, and guidance and are accordingly enforced. The University should also ensure that it uses software and associated documentation in accordance with the software licensing agreement and applicable copyright laws. For software and associated documentation protected by quantity licenses, the University should employ tracking systems to control copying and distribution. The University should also limit and document the use of publicly accessible peer-to-peer file-sharing technology to ensure that this capability is not used for the unauthorized distribution, display, performance, or reproduction of copyrighted work.

8.4.4.3 Systems Maintenance

The Committee noted that that maintenance of systems at Makerere University was not taken seriously. In the early 2000s the University procured ITS an ERP System for education management but did not put in place a sustainable service level agreement. It was also observed that it is typical at Makerere University to ‘fix it when it breaks if it is critical or else abandon it.’ Computer Labs in the School of Computing and Informatics Technology and other Schools continuously deteriorated without being serviced or replaced accordingly. The University had not prioritised and implemented best practices for servicing and maintenance of ICT systems, equipment and Software.
8.4.4.4 Configuration Management

The Committee obtained no evidence of configuration management protocols for production systems at Makerere University. The University requires that system developers/integrators implement and document a configuration management process that (1) manages and controls changes to the system during design, development, implementation, and operation; (2) tracks security flaws; and (3) includes organisational approval of changes. Cases were cited where a system developer also employed as a systems administrator in the AR Office would make unauthorised changes to results data with limited audit trailing given that the said officer had database level (Back-End) user privileges to modify data without a trace.

8.4.4.5 Critical Need for an Integrated ERP System for Makerere University

There have been several attempts to implement an integrated ERP SYSTEM at Makerere University addressing the key functions of Admissions, Registration, Timetabling, Results Managements, Academic Documentation Management, Financial Management (including Bank Interface), Library Information System, e-Learning, and Human Resource Management (recruitment to Retirement). The ITS License has not been renewed running off obsolete servers, while on the other hand the CEMAS Project has faced serious challenges. The University urgently needs to acquire and implement a comprehensive ERP System. Three options can be quickly explore:

(1) **Renewal and Upgrade of the ITS License** and full implementation of the system for Admissions, Registration, Timetabling, Results Managements, Academic Documentation Management, Financial Management (including Bank Interface), Library Information System, e-Learning, and Human Resource Management (recruitment to Retirement). This approach seems to be the low hanging fruits since ITS is already at the university, the system and vendor are reputable meaning the chance for project success is high with limited requirements for data migration.

(2) **Fast-Tracking the Implementation of the CEMAS Project**: There is need here for the University, Vendor and Project Manager (Accountant General) to agree on a Change Management Plan and implement a plan which progressively brings on-board key services after careful consideration of the relevant system requirements. Leadership of the project may also require to be reviewed to ensure that there is a streamlined project team at Makerere University motivated to ensure the project is successful and is fully owned by the University. The biggest threat to this approach is data migration.

(3) **Exploring Home-Grown Solution**: Kyambogo University has implement e-Kampus; IUIU has also successfully implemented a system for Education Management. There is need to study these success stories and others not mentioned here to explore key lessons and develop a strategy if the University choses to take this direction. The biggest threat here is the technology shall require to be proven and this shall require time to ascertain its integrity and fitness for purpose.

It is important to observe that change management and implementation of any ERP System at Makerere University shall be a challenging undertaking given the complex implementation and deployment environment with many business rules and at times policies which require flexibility in implementation e.g. the fee policy. There is therefore need for maturity and objectivity in seeking a solution and ultimately management commitment and resolve to realize the selected approach.
8.4.5 System and Information Integrity

8.4.5.1 Systems Integrity

The integrity of Information Systems (Results and Finance Systems) has come under question with allegations of gross malfeasance. The Committee received allegations of change of students’ grades and irregular refunds to students. The University was advised to report the case to police for detailed investigations. Several Staff in the AR Department were subsequently arrested and the cases were proceeding in Court.

The integrity of systems and information hosted therein is defined in terms of degree of correctness for intended functionality and degree of resilience to attack by explicitly identified levels of adversary capability. In addition, but not as a replacement for this expression of degree of correctness and resilience, the level of integrity may also be described in terms of levels of developmental assurance, that is, actions taken in the specification, design, development, implementation, and operation/maintenance of the system that impact the degree of correctness and resilience achieved. It was noted that for network and internet resource DICTS deploys several Monitoring Tools for system integrity. However, the Information Systems do not have comprehensive Tools for monitoring and detecting fraud.

Additionally, the tendency of University Officers to leave the loading of marks to unauthorised personnel especially registrars, administrative assistants and part time staff on the system compromises the integrity of the systems. There is need for streamlined procedures at the University for the Results Management Systems clearly articulating the roles and responsibilities of each actor in the value chain and the necessary Results Data Warehousing Protocols.

Production Systems require regular security testing and validation of the security controls against threats including but not limited to intrusion and penetration by hackers; status of user accounts especially the interactive accounts, and issues relating to disaster recover.

8.4.5.2 Disaster Recover

It is critical the University implements a disaster recovery site off campus to secure critical data against the risk of loss. This is important considering that the connection to Kabanyolo is no-longer active for back up and the system utilising tapes is also obsolete and non-functional. Development of a comprehensive disaster recovery site for Makerere University is a cost intensive project which should be undertaken quickly but with careful consideration of plausible alternatives including exploring collaborations with Government Departments for resource sharing say with Finance which already has a well-established Disaster Recovery Site.

8.4.5.3 Access Control

The Committee observed that all system used at Makerere University apart from the payments system from Stanbic used basic single factor authentication architecture. Some server rooms/data centres had biometric authentication systems and CCTV system for surveillance. The use of single factor authentication for users with rights to modify results data is very risky and should be mitigated with appropriate two factor authentication technology as it is now a standard practice in reputable organisations. There is also need to implement access control lists for all end-user devices to ensure that University ICT resources are consumed by authorised users. The limited resources at Makerere University cannot support open access but also open access compromises University systems. Guests can be identified and granted guest access accordingly, a typical practice elsewhere.
8.4.5.4 Audit and Accountability

There is no evidence that Makerere University periodically audits the institution’s information systems. Periodic audits and logging of the information systems needs to be implemented to validate that the security mechanisms present during system validation testing are still installed and operating correctly. These security audits review and examine a system’s records and activities to determine the adequacy of system security controls and to ensure compliance with established information security policy and procedures. Audits also are used to detect breaches in security services through examination of system logs. Logging is necessary for anomalies detection as well as forensic analysis where applicable.

8.4.6 ICT Systems Information and Document Management

ICT Systems information and document management should generally be a part of the University’s records retention and document management system. Digital and hardcopy information associated with the development and execution of a system is important and sensitive and needs to be managed.

In addition, business conditions change and require updated analyses and studies. Care must be given to protection of this information and verify that the appropriate versions are retained. Inherent in this is an information classification system that allows information assets to receive the appropriate level of protection. The committee observed that there are no streamlined procedures at Makerere University of Systems Information and Documentation Management. Several systems in use lack the basic information and Manuals for Configuration Management and there maintenance is totally dependent on individuals presenting a risk of loss of institutional information assets.

Makerere University needs to develop policies and procedures detailing the retention of University information especially regarding the ICT Systems. These procedures should address retention/destruction issues for all applicable information media (CDs, DVDS, Flash Drives, and Computer Drivers etc.). Any legal or regulatory requirements must be considered when developing these policies and procedures. The policies and procedures should detail access, sharing, copying, transmittal, distribution, and disposal or destruction of ICT systems information. These policies or procedures should include periodic review of all information to ensure it is properly handled. The University should thus protect information against unauthorized access, misuse, or corruption during transportation or transmission. The policies and procedures should further provide for classifying data, including establishing:

1. Retention policies and procedures for both electronic and paper media
2. Classification policies and methods (e.g., restricted, classified, general)
3. Access and control policies, to include sharing, copying, transmittal, and distribution appropriate for the level of protection required
4. Access to the data based on formally assigned roles and responsibilities for the systems.

8.4.7 Information Security Awareness and Training

Information security awareness is a critical part of system incident prevention, particularly with regard to social engineering threats. The committee noted that this is done at Makerere University even for users on security critical results and financial management system. All users at the University should go through information security training especially during induction for staff and orientation for students.

DICTS in collaboration with the college ICT staff should design and implement effective training programs based on individuals’ roles and responsibilities for all users and do regular
refresher training for users of security critical system (results and finance system). Collecting feedback from users can be valuable for refining the training program. The University should ensure that information security awareness and training policy and procedures are consistent with applicable laws, directives, policies, regulations, standards, and guidance.

8.4.8 Incident Response and End-User Support

8.4.8.1 Incident Response

The Committee noted the lack of clear incident response procedures in case of a critical system failure or shutdown. The shutdown of the Results Management System though necessary resulted into protracted denial of service to legitimate consumers of academic documentation. This indicated lack of proper incident response planning.

Incident response addresses the capability to continue or resume operations of a system in the event of disruption of normal system operation. Incident response entails the preparation, testing and maintenance of specific policies and procedures to enable the organisation to recover the system’s operational status after the occurrence of a disruption. The ability for the system to function after such an event is directly dependent on implementing policies, procedures, training, and resources in place ahead of time using the organisation’s planning process.

8.4.8.2 Terms of Use

DICTS has an end-user support unit albeit with Staff on temporary terms of 6 months contract renewed with instances in excess of 7 years. The obtaining laws should be adhered to avoid risks of litigation. The Committee however noted a gap in terms of use as is the standard practice for all systems globally.

8.4.9 IT Governance and Management Structure

Makerere University established the Directorate of Information and Communications Technology Support (DICTS) in 2000. The Directorate is the central service unit that provides expert services and guidance on ICT to all academic and administrative units of the University. DICTS is led by a Director who reports directly to the Vice Chancellor. The Council ICT Committee ensures that the strategic importance of ICT to research, teaching and learning, outreach as well as administration, is always taken into account in all University policies, plans, budgets, and operations.

The Visitation Committee observed that several positions in the DICTS establishment were either not filled or filled with staff on 6 months’ temporary contracts for periods in excess of 7 years including positions of managers. It was also noted that ICT staff in Colleges (Web Administrators and Systems Administrators) were not structurally linked to the DICTS structure creating line of authority and reporting structural gaps. Staff in DICTS indicated to the Committee challenges associated with their emoluments: they were not enhanced as Scientist and typically the payment of salaries especially for Staff on temporary staff was ad hoc. Funding the ICT budget was also reported as a challenge inhibiting the implementation of the proposed ICT Plans including system maintenance. It was noted that most of the ICT Infrastructure was funded through development partners. The introduction of the Technology Fee was yet to have impact of the University ICT Programme. These structural and financial challenges necessitate attention by Makerere University Council to streamline the issues and ensure the proper operation of DICTS.
8.5 RECOMMENDATIONS ON UTILISATION OF IT

The use of proven technology to enhance efficiency and effectiveness is no longer a choice for a competitive institution but an imperative. The gross allegations that academic and human resources records at Makerere University lack the instructive integrity are unacceptable in this information age and are serving to impair the progress made in the Ugandan Higher Education System. IT governance is a framework that ensures that an organisation's IT Infrastructure and Systems support and enables the achievement of its corporate strategies and objectives. The Visitation Committee observed that IT Governance at Makerere University must be streamlined to serve the University in realising her strategic goals. The following are the key recommendations:

8.5.1 ICT Physical and Environmental Security

(1) Makerere University should:-

(2) invest in the recommended ICT physical and environmental security to secure the investment in ICT equipment.

(3) streamline the acquisition, in-house development and maintenance processes to mitigate the ingredient risks associated with system integrity, configuration management, business continuity as well as systems compatibility.

(4) establish a centralised procurement effort to leverage the economies of scale in bargaining with vendors and service providers for efficient pricing and campus-wide Service Level Agreements on common equipment and productivity software and systems.

(5) streamline the systems development process for the innovations adopted into the mainstream operations of the University.

(6) stop the use of pirated software at the University.

(7) ensure that ICT system and services acquisition policy and procedures are consistent with applicable laws, directives, policies, regulations, standards, and guidance and are accordingly enforced. The University should also ensure that it uses software and associated documentation in accordance with the software licensing agreement and applicable copyright laws. For software and associated documentation protected by quantity licenses, the University should employ tracking systems to control copying and distribution. The University should also limit and document the use of publicly accessible peer-to-peer file-sharing technology to ensure that this capability is not used for the un-authorised distribution, display, performance, or reproduction of copyrighted work.

(8) prioritise and implement best practices for servicing and maintenance of ICT systems, equipment and Software.

(9) explore institutionalizing a policy and procedures for using systems for management of security critical business processes including examination, results management, admissions, financial transaction, etc. where fraud can greatly dent the reputation of the University.

8.5.2 Technology as a Pedagogical Enabler

Universities worldwide are utilising technology to create pedagogical opportunity for scholars around the world. The Makerere University Top Brand in Africa should be leveraged through Technology to take advantage of the emerging revenue stream through online teaching and learning. The academic-staff already have content, what is required is
streamlining the eLearning systems and processes to leverage this opportunity space as a low hanging fruit for the University.

8.5.3 System and Information Integrity

The integrity of Information Systems (Results and Finance Systems) has come under question with allegations of gross malfeasance. The Committee recommends the following:

(1) The University should delineate roles and responsibilities for all actors involved in the use and administration of Information Systems at Makerere University. There is need for a structured approach to loading information, updating information and authorising all the aspects as well as provisions for system level supervision in case of updates and changes to the system and stored information. Use of best practices in line with the Business Processes and Procedures implemented meticulously at system level would go a long way in addressing these gaps.

(2) There is need for streamlined procedures at the University for the Results Management Systems clearly articulating the roles and responsibilities of each actor in the value chain and the necessary Results Data Warehousing Protocols.

(3) There should be regular security testing and validation of the security controls against threats including but not limited to intrusion and penetration by hackers; status of user accounts especially the interactive accounts, and issues relating to disaster recover.

(4) The University should implement a disaster recovery site off campus to secure critical data against the risk of loss. This is important considering that the connection to Kabanyolo is no-longer active for back up and the system utilising tapes is also obsolete and non-functional. Development of a comprehensive disaster recovery site for Makerere University is a cost intensive project which should be undertaken quickly but with careful consideration of plausible alternatives including exploring collaborations with Government Departments for resource sharing say with Finance which already has a well-established Disaster Recovery Site.

(5) There is need to implement access control lists for all end-user devices to ensure that University ICT resources are consumed by authorised users. The limited resources at Makerere University cannot support open access but also open access compromises University systems. Guests can be identified and granted guest access accordingly, a typical practice elsewhere.

(6) The University should carry out periodic audits and logging of the information systems to validate that the security mechanisms present during system validation testing are still installed and operating correctly.

8.5.4 Integrated ERP System

The University lacked a functioning system and continued to rely on obsolete IT Infrastructure and makeshift fragmented systems which predisposed self-seeking Staff to take advantage to abuse the system resulting into alteration of academic and financial records. The Government Initiative to implement the CEMAS Project for Public Universities was also grossly encumbered and its fate remains unknown. The issue of implementing a comprehensive Education Management System at Makerere University (Integrated ERP System) is critical and must be addressed urgently. The University should:

(1) Prioritise and rationalise the utilisation of Current Generation Information Technology to enhance Business Process Efficiency and Effectiveness in Teaching and Learning, Admissions, Registration, Academic Records Management, Human
Resource Management; Procurement; Financial Management; and in Communication and Stakeholder Engagement.

(2) Immediately deploy a Comprehensive Information System Integrated to secure data integrity. This should be a minimum requirement to automate the:

a) Link between Student Academic and Financial Records
b) Link between Human Resource Records and the Payroll.

It is important to observe that change management and implementation of any ERP System at Makerere University shall be a challenging undertaking given the complex implementation and deployment environment with many business rules and at times policies which require flexibility in implementation e.g. the Fees Policy. There is therefore need for maturity and objectivity in seeking a solution and ultimately Management commitment and resolve to realise the selected approach.

8.5.5 Enforcement of Information Security Policies and Procedures

Information is a very important University asset and all University Members have a responsibility to make sure that information is kept safe and used appropriately. Without due care, personal, research or business information can be abused, misplaced or leaked. There is an added difficulty of having to protect the information against increasingly proactive and sophisticated attempts at theft or falsification. Therefore, the University must:

(1) enforce the Information Security Policies approved by Council to ensure that only those who need access to data have that access and associated data management rights.

(2) establish and make readily available to all system users a set of rules that describes their responsibilities and expected behavior with regard to ICT system usage including clauses on acceptable use extending to email and social media use at Makerere University.

(3) obtain signed acknowledgment from users indicating that they have read, understand, and agree to abide by the rules of behaviour before authorising access to the University system(s).

8.5.6 Incident Response and End-User Support

The Committee noted the lack of clear incident response procedures in case of a critical system failure or shutdown. It is therefore recommended that Makerere University:

(1) develops policies and procedures for incident response, monitoring, handling, reporting, testing, training, recovery, and reconstitution of the systems for critical systems with specific focus on the AR and Finance Departments.

(2) develops an incident investigation and analysis programme, either internally or externally, to investigate incidents. These investigations need to consider incidents based on the potential outcome as well as the actual outcome, recognising that IT system incidents may include intentional and/or unintentional incidents.

(3) develops, tests, deploys, and fully documents an incident investigation process. The incident and analysis investigation process must specify the roles and responsibilities of law enforcement and/or other critical stakeholders in an internal and shared incident investigation process.
8.5.7 Strategic Planning and Funding IT

The strategic planning function in respect of IT should be comprehensive and mindful of the most cost efficient methodology for sustainable delivery of the Makerere University IT Program which is meaningful and relevant to the University aspirations of teaching & learning; research and innovation; and community outreach. The strategic plan especially a five year plan must have a detailed cost structure for the prescribed objectives to inform budgeting and funding of the program. The University urgently needs to develop the IT cost structures to inform the funding of the IT Programs at Makerere University.

8.5.8 Procurement of IT Equipment, Systems and Software

There is need to streamline and centralise the procurement of IT Systems, Equipment and Software to leverage economies of scale while engaging vendors and secure scalable Service Level Agreements and Software Licenses for productivity Software.

8.5.9 IT Governance and Management Structures

Addressing the structure of DICTS, staffing, and competitive compensation of the IT Staff is critical. The University should:

(1) develop and implement a DICTS structure with the required staffing and reasonable emoluments mindful of the Collegiate system and obtaining requirements.

(2) recruit a qualified and experienced Senior Academician as the Top Executive at DICTS (i.e. Director DICTS) to facilitate proper integration of IT into the core Business Operations of the University.
## CHAPTER NINE: ACTION PLAN

### 9.1 HIGHER EDUCATION STRATEGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Review Higher Education Investment Plan</td>
<td>(2) National Council for Higher Education (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Report on Stakeholders Consultative Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Stakeholder Consultations</td>
<td>(3) National Planning Authority (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Approved HESP 2018/19-2027/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Draft and Approve HE SP 2018/19-2027/28</td>
<td>(4) Universities &amp; Other Tertiary Institutions in Uganda (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Development Partners (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.2 HIGHER EDUCATION OVERSIGHT STRUCTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructure the Higher Education Sub-Sector &amp; Public University System</td>
<td>Ministry of Higher Education Science, Technology &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>(1) Restructure the Ministry of Science Technology &amp; Innovations into the Ministry of Higher Education Science and Technology</td>
<td>(1) Government (Responsible &amp; Approves)</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>(1) Ministry of Higher Education Science, Technology, &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makerere University as a National Public University System</td>
<td>(2) Establish Makerere University as a National Public University System with Regional Campus (Makerere University Busitema instead of Busitema University, etc.)</td>
<td>(2) National Council for Higher Education (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Makerere University National Public University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Amend UOTIA 2001 as amended to Empower the Line Minister to Appoint, Supervise, Discipline and Remove Vice Chancellor, members of University Council, Executive Director of NCHE &amp; members of NCHE</td>
<td>(3) National Planning Authority (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) NCHE with 13 Member and Competence Based Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Reduce the Size of NCHE to 13 Members with Competence Based Composition</td>
<td>(4) Universities &amp; Other Tertiary Institutions in Uganda (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Amount of Funds Available for NCHE Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Streamline Funding for NCHE</td>
<td>(5) Development Partners (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Line Minister with Powers to Appoint, Supervise, Discipline and Remove Vice Chancellor, members of University Council, Executive Director of NCHE &amp; members of NCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) UOTIA 2001 Accordingly Amended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.3 HIGHER EDUCATION LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Make Regulations for Operationalisation of UOTIA 2001/3/6 and Amend UOTIA 2001/3/6 in line with Recommendations of the Visitation Committee on Makerere University 2016/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Make Comments to the Chancellor Makerere University to request the Ministry of Education to put in place a framework for implementation of the Visitation Committee report</td>
<td>(1) His Excellency the President/Visitor</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>(1) Comments of the Visitor to the Chancellor Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Make Comments to the Chancellor Makerere University to request the Ministry of Education to put in place a framework for implementation of the Visitation Committee report</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Adopt the Visitation Committee on Makerere University 2016/17 Report as a Government Green Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Inter-Ministerial Committee to Develop a Government White Paper on the Rwendeire Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Set up an Inter-Ministerial Committee to Develop a Government White Paper on the Rwendeire Committee Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Line Ministry (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Government White Paper on the Rwendeire Committee Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Accordingly Amended UOTIA 2001 as amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Chancellor Makerere University (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Stakeholder Consultation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) NCHE in line with her mandate makes Regulations for Operationalisation of UOTIA 2001 as amended (Ethical Standards for Members of a Public University, Regulations for Student &amp; Staff Associations, Visitations by the NCHE, Minimum Requirements &amp; Standards Formation of Constituent Colleges &amp; Affiliation, Formation of University Policies)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Universities &amp; Other Tertiary Institutions (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Higher Education Consultation Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Office of the Attorney General (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Regulations for Operationalisation of UOTIA 2001 as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Development Partners (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Amended UOTIA 2001 as amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9.4 THE COUNCIL AND SENATE OF A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streamline the Size, Composition, Structure, Functions and Powers of the Council and Senate of a Public University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The Size of Council Reduced to 15 members with a Competence Based Composition and Committee Structure, as Recommended by the Rwendeire Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) UOTIA 2001/3/6 amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The Vice Chancellor as the Chief Executive and Accounting Officer of a Public University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 15 Members University Council (nine (9) independent members from outside the University with knowledge, competencies and experience in key areas of higher education governance, a representative of the Makerere University convocation, the Vice Chancellor as an ex-officio, one representative of academic staff as an ex-officio, one representative of non-teaching staff as an ex-officio, one rep. of graduate students as an ex-officio and one representative of undergraduate students as an ex-officio) Appointed by the Line Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) University Council Functions and Powers Revised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) University Council Functions and Powers Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Gazette Governance Charter for Makerere University</td>
<td>(1) Line Ministry (Approves &amp; Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Gazette Governance Charter for Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) VC as CEO &amp; Accounting Officer</td>
<td>(2) National Council for Higher Education (Approves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) VC as CEO &amp; Accounting Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) University Secretary as Director Legal &amp; Secretary to University Council</td>
<td>(3) Universities and Other Tertiary Institutions (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) University Secretary as Director Legal &amp; Secretary to University Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Streamline Senate Membership</td>
<td>(4) University Council (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Streamline Senate Membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Amend UOTIA 2001/3/6 in accordance with the recommendations of the Rwendeire Committee and specifically:
(2) Implement the Amended Law
(3) Develop and Gazette Makerere University Governance Charter
(4) Streamline Organisational & Governance Structures of Makerere University to establish clear Lines of Authority and Reporting Structures for all Staff and Governance Bodies,
(5) Ensure competence based rather than constituency based membership on the governance bodies of the University
(6) Streamline Senate Size and Composition
(7) Streamline the Composition of the Top Management Team
(8) Streamline the relationship between Senate and Top Management
(9) Adopt a clear structure for policy documents including linkages to previous polices and obtaining laws and regulations with express statement of the obtaining relationship(s). The policy structure should provide for the policy name, approval authority, responsible executive, responsible office, date of original issue, dates of earlier revisions, policy statement, reason(s) for policy, who should read the policy, related documents, & contacts in case of information about the policy.
## 9.5 COLLEGIATE SYSTEM AT MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complete Operationalisation of Collegiate System</td>
<td>1) Develop a Twenty Year Operational Viability Analysis of Collegiate System with Clear Strategy, Governance &amp; Management Structures, Systems, Staffing, Cost Structures &amp; Revenue Streams</td>
<td>(1) Line Ministry (Approves &amp; Responsible)</td>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>(1) Twenty Year Operational Viability Analysis of Collegiate System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Restructure: (a) College of Health Science into College of Medicine &amp; College of Public Health</td>
<td>(2) National Council for Higher Education (Approves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) College of Medicine &amp; College of Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) CHUSS into College of College of Social Sciences &amp; College of Humanities</td>
<td>(3) Makerere University Council (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) College of Social Sciences &amp; College of Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) School of Law and COBAMS into College of Law and Business</td>
<td>(4) Makerere University Management (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) CAES at Kabanyolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) To decongest the Main Campus and focus on Graduate Training and Research, Makerere University should explore the following: a) Relocate CAES to Kabanyolo, b) The undergraduate programmes at CEES should be transferred and consolidated at Kyambogo which is historically the premium Institution for pedagogical sciences. CEES should then focus on graduate training and research. c) The undergraduate programmes at COBAMS should be transferred and consolidated at MUBS, an institution affiliated to Makerere University focusing on Business Studies. The Business School under the College of Law and Business should then focus on graduate training and research in Business Studies. d) The undergraduate programmes at CHUSS should be transferred and consolidated at Nsamizi Training Institute of Social Development. The College of College of Social Sciences &amp; College of Humanities should then focus on graduate training and research.</td>
<td>(5) Kyambogo University, MUBS, Nsamizi Training Institute for Social Development (Support)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) MOU between Mulago &amp; Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Streamline the Relationship between Mulago Hospital &amp; Makerere University</td>
<td>(6) Colleges (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Jinja Off-Shore Campus Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Fast-Track the Restricting of Central Administrative Units</td>
<td>(7) Staff &amp; Students (Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Central Administrative Units Aligned to Collegiate System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) Close Jinja Off-Shore Campus</td>
<td>(8) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) College Statute Amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) Amend the College Statute accordingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9) Termination of Undergraduate Admissions for Business Studies, Education, Humanities &amp; Social Sciences at Makerere University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8) Level of Autonomy of Colleges (Powers Devolved to Colleges)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10) Level of Autonomy of Colleges (Powers Devolved to Colleges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.6 Human Resource Management at Makerere University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1)        | Restructure and Strengthen the Human Resource Management Systems                                        | (1) Amend UOTIA 2001/3/6 to Process with an Open and Competitive Recruitment Process for All Employees of a Public University (Administrative, Academic, Research/Project, & Support Staff)  
(2) Recruit qualified, experienced and seasoned HR Professionals for the positions of HR in the University including leadership of the Appointments Board  
(3) Devolve some of the staff recruitment functions and powers to the Colleges  
(4) Develop and Approve a Comprehensive Job Analysis Handbook with an Optimised HR Plan cognizant of the Collegiate System  
(5) Systematically Layoff redundant Staff including redeployed cleaners & Cooks and Mis-qualified Administrative Staff  
(6) Fully Automate the HR Processes from Recruitment, through Payroll Management, Performance Management etc.  
(7) Streamline and Operationalise a Comprehensive Induction Programme for All Staff Recruited to New Positions including Training all Staff in Leadership Position in Higher Education Governance, Leadership & Management; and Training Academic Staff in Pedagogical Sciences  
(8) Implement Contract Employment for All Non-Teaching Staff and Academic Staff below Associate Professor Rank  
(9) Institute an Automated Performance Management System for All Staff  
(10) Institute a performance based remuneration/salary system  
(11) Streamline and Harmonise the HR Manual with Collegiate System with Proper Policy Traceability  
(12) Streamline and Operationalise the Grievance Management System  
(13) Streamline Allowances and Benefits and Abolish the unsustainable Salary Incentive  
(14) Clear all Overdue Pension Arrears and Staff Benefits  
(15) Streamline the management of Staff Housing  
(16) Centralise all payroll management functions to the Directorate of HRM and Clean up the Payroll  
(2) Makerere University Council (Responsible & Approves)  
(3) Makerere University Management (Responsible)  
(4) Staff & Students (Supports)  
(5) Other Stakeholders (Informed) | Medium-Term  
(1) UOTIA 2001/3/6 Amended in line with Activity (1)  
(2) Qualified HR Professionals  
(3) Job Analysis Handbook with HR Plan  
(4) Robust Human Resource Information System part of the University Wide Integrated Information System  
(5) No. of Staff with Leadership and Pedagogical Training  
(6) No. of Staff on Contract Terms  
(7) No. of Redundant Staff Laid Off  
(8) Amount if Pension Arrears and terminal Benefits Cleared  | (1) Robust Human Resource Information System part of the University Wide Integrated Information System  
(5) No. of Staff with Leadership and Pedagogical Training  
(6) No. of Staff on Contract Terms  
(7) No. of Redundant Staff Laid Off  
(8) Amount if Pension Arrears and terminal Benefits Cleared | (11) Payroll Management Function Centralised in DRHM with Clean Payroll  
(12) Restructure and up to date HR Web Portal  
(13) No. of Staff Houses Reclaimed from Retired Staff and Allocated to legitimate staff  
(14) Clear Performance Metrics for Academic & Research Staff  
(15) Annual Staff Appraise Reports |
### 9.7 UTILIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 9.8 RELEVANCE AND QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the relevance and quality of teaching and learning</td>
<td>Restructured and Relevant Programmes</td>
<td>(1) Convene a national curriculum mapping for all academic programmes offered in all public universities to identify programme duplication and create niches. (2) Streamline accreditation, and M&amp;E procedures for public Universities by NCHE. (3) Restructure current academic programmes to meet national needs. (4) Submit restructured programmes to NCHE for accreditation. (5) Engage key stakeholders in programme review and development. (6) Review University Entry Requirements to improve the quality of scholarship. (7) Adopt student-centred competence-based model of teaching and learning. (8) Pedagogical training for academic staff and technicians with emphasis of the use of student-centred competence-based model. (9) Align ratios of Students to Staff to NCHE standards. (10) Strengthen and expand the distance/blended learning infrastructure, space, and human resource. (11) Strengthen monitoring &amp; evaluation of teaching and learning processes. (12) Establish college Career Centres at Makerere University for academic &amp; professional guidance, and psycho-socio support for staff &amp; students.</td>
<td>(1) Line Ministry (Approves) (2) National Council for Higher Education (Responsible &amp; Approves) (3) Makerere University and other public universities (Responsible) (4) National Planning Authority (Supports) (5) National Council for Science &amp; Technology (Supports) (6) Professional Bodies, Industry, Employers, &amp; Alumni (Consulted) (7) Development Partners (Consulted) (8) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Activity No. 1 &amp; 11– Medium Term Key Activity No. 2, 3, 4 &amp; 7– Short Term Key Activities Nos. 5–11 are Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.9 STEM ENROLMENT AND PROGRAMMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improve enrolment, content delivery and infrastructure for STEM Programmes | Improved STEM enrolment and programmes | (1) Scale-up the affirmative funding for STI to basic levels of education (primary and secondary) and to PTCs and NTCs to widen catchment for STEM.  
(2) Review, strengthen and expand SESEMAT programmes to enhance effectiveness of practical teaching of Science and Mathematics in Secondary Schools;  
(3) Strengthen University-Private Sector Partnerships for STEM Training and Research.  
(4) Increase HESFB funding to improve STEM Enrolment.  
(5) Develop institutional STEM Strategy addressing the quality, relevance and delivery of programmes.  
(6) Establish STEM laboratories with specialised capabilities for pedagogical and commercial purposes.  
(7) Scale-up Internet and Virtual-Labs to improve access and the learning and research experience.  
(8) Strengthen career guidance at basic and higher education levels through streamlined academic advisory and counseling services at the University with relevant outreach programmes to Secondary Schools.  
(9) Establish Science & Technology Parks and Museums. | (1) Line Ministry (Responsible & Approves)  
(2) National Council for Higher Education (Consulted & Approves STEM Programmes)  
(3) Makerere University and other public universities (Responsible)  
(4) National Planning Authority (Consulted & Supports)  
(5) National Council for Science & Technology (Consulted & Supports)  
(6) Professional Bodies, Industry, Employers, Alumni (Consulted & Support)  
(7) Development Partners (Consulted & Support) | Medium Term | (1) Amount of additional funding allocated for STI  
(2) No. of Teachers Trained under the SESEMAT Programme  
(3) No. of Active Partnerships between the University and the Private Sector for STEM Training & Research  
(4) Amount of additional funding allocated to the Student Loan Scheme  
(5) No. of STEM students accessing the HESFB loans  
(6) Stakeholders Consultative Report on the STEM Strategy  
(7) Makerere University STEM Strategy  
(8) No. of STI laboratories offering both pedagogical and professional services  
(9) No. of Scholars utilising Internet & Virtual Labs  
(10) No. of Career Guidance Fairs Conducted  
(11) No. of Students utilising the academic advisory services.  
(12) No. of Science & Technology Parks and Museums established |
### 9.10 MANAGEMENT OF ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Address the gaps in the academic assessment and examinations processes in order to strengthen and conscientiously guard academic quality | Streamlined & Transparent Academic Management System | (1) Periodically audit the academic assessment & examination systems and processes  
(2) Review, gazette, and operationalise the University’s academic policies  
(3) Digitise academic records including archives  
(4) Establish a secure archive for University academic records.  
(5) Establish structures and systems for centralised marking at college level.  
(6) Strengthen systems for addressing malfeasance resulting from trading grades for favours including sex and money; as well as missing and changing grades.  
(7) Discipline and apply appropriate sanctions for the errant staff and students  
(8) Operationalise the NHCE Credit Accumulation and Transfer System  
(9) Establish a System to enable the Course Instructor to personally upload grades onto the Results Management System and be personally culpable for all modifications | (1) Makerere University Senate and Council (Responsible & Approves)  
(2) Line Ministry (Informed & Supports)  
(3) National Council for Higher Education (Informed & Supports)  
(4) Department, School and College Academic Boards (Responsible)  
(5) Staff and Students (Responsible and Supports)  
(6) Low Enforcement Agencies (Consulted & Support)  
(7) Other Stakeholders (Informed) | Key Activity (1) is Continuous Short-Term for Key Activities (2) – (7) | (1) Audit Reports on management of academic assessment and examination processes  
(2) Gazetted academic policies  
(3) No. of Academic Records digitised  
(4) Secure Archive for Academic Records  
(5) Centralised Examinations Marking  
(6) No. of errant staff and students sanctioned for examination malpractices.  
(7) No. Students Transferred within and among Higher Education Institutions  
(8) Course Instructors uploading grades onto the Results management System |
### 9.11 RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 9.12 KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Streamline Structures Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking</td>
<td>(1) Streamline the KTPs Unit under the DRGT to perform this 3rd core function.</td>
<td>(1) Makerere University Council (Approves)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(1) Operational KTPs Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking Policy</td>
<td>(2) Support Academic Staff to undergo Faculty Industry Attachment (FIA) programmes to further improve relevance and quality of teaching and research.</td>
<td>(2) Makerere University Management (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Establish University Career Centre to link staff, students and graduates to the labour market and industry.</td>
<td>(3) Line Ministry (Informed &amp; Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Review the Internship Programme as part of the ongoing curriculum restructuring process, to address issues of relevance and management.</td>
<td>(4) National Council for Higher Education (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Formulate a Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networking Policy</td>
<td>(5) Development Partners (Support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Establish Industry Advisory Board (IAB) to link influential professionals and recognised leaders to University.</td>
<td>(6) Other Stakeholders (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Establish a Model for Utilisation of Specialised Laboratories for Commercial Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Enhance Community Access to University Incubation Centres and Facilities for Skills Development &amp; Entrepreneurship Incubation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KPIs:

1. No. of Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and Networks Established.
2. No. of Incubatees/Entrepreneurs Incubated Annually.
3. No. of industry liaison and outreach activities.
4. No. of IPRs.
5. No. of businesses developed.
6. No. of technologies transferred.
7. No. of startup companies and new ventures formed around Makerere University.
8. Revenue Generated from Commercial Services.
9. No. of research alliances and collaborations negotiated with industry.
10. Amount of funds from industry-sponsored research for Makerere University.
## 9.13 STUDENT POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address the inconsistencies in students' Nominal Roll for improved University strategic Planning</td>
<td>(1) A cleaned-up Students' Nominal Roll</td>
<td>(1) Explain and justify the existence of the 16,239 students not verified during the headcount.</td>
<td>(1) University Council (Approves)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>(1) Report explaining and justifying the existence of the 16,239 students not verified during the headcount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Report on investigation of 4,235 students with documentation who do not appear on the nominal rolls.</td>
<td>(2) Investigate why 4,235 students with documentation do not appear on the nominal rolls.</td>
<td>(2) University Senate (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Report investigating why the 4,235 students with documentation do not appear on the nominal rolls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Report on investigation of 4,353 students who do not appear on the nominal rolls.</td>
<td>(3) Match infrastructure and resources for both study and welfare services to students' numbers.</td>
<td>(3) University Management (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Updated and accurate students' nominal roll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Reconcile students' numbers with the University's actual income from fees collection for better planning</td>
<td>(4) Reconcile students' numbers with the University's actual income from fees collection for better planning</td>
<td>(4) Inspector General of Government (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Report on acceptable models of decongesting the Main Campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) The IGG should Investigate the anomalies in the student Nominal Roll</td>
<td>(5) Other internal and external stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td>(5) Other internal and external stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Nationally (NCHE) acceptable students to infrastructure and resources Ratio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short Term – up to 1 Year: Medium Term – up to 3 Years: Long Term – up to 7 Years
## 9.14 MANAGEMENT OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Management of Students’ Affairs and Service Delivery</td>
<td>(1) Reviewed University Policies related to Students’ Welfare (2) Students’ Grievance Management System</td>
<td>(1) Create a platform for engaging students, parents/guardians and university management. (2) Strengthen the grievance management system for students. (3) Improve the identification system for students, staff and visitors to facilitate legitimate use of University resources and enhance campus security. (4) Establish a list of accredited students’ hostels reviewed annually. (5) Streamline student guild structures to affirmatively include graduate students. (6) Develop and implement strategies for students to engage in engagement in philanthropic activities and community services. (7) Review the fees policy to provide for a case-by-case payment plan for students with genuine financial challenges. (8) Explore partnership internet service providers to improve the Wi-Fi experiences all over the main campus. (9) Facilitate the student guild to operate the on Campus kiosks, secretarial bureaus, beauty and wellness parlours (saloons), among other commercial units targeting students as clients, as income generating streams to support guild programs. (10) Government should fast track the plans to rehabilitate all halls of residence.</td>
<td>(1) University Council (Approves) (2) University Senate (Responsible &amp; Consulted) (3) University Management (Responsible) (4) Development Partners (Support) (5) Other internal and external stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>(1) Streamlined Structures &amp; Systems for Management of Students’ Affairs and Services (from Admission, Campus Life to Graduation) (2) An Operational Students’ Engagement Strategy (3) Completion and graduation rates (4) No. of student-led/guided innovations and patents (5) Streamlined Identification System for Students, Staff &amp; Visitors. (6) Rehabilitated Halls of Residence (7) Ratio of Graduate: Undergraduate Students on the Guild (8) No. of students’ registered complaints every semester (9) No. of student-led strikes in Academic Year (10) Frequency and time taken to provide students feedback from grievances raised in Suggestions Boxes in Colleges and Halls of Residence. (11) College Counseling and Guidance Structures (12) No. of Students Accessing Counseling and Guidance Services at College Level (13) List of Accredited Students’ Hostels (14) No. of philanthropic activities and community service events held per semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.15 Financial Planning and Budgeting Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streamline the Financial Planning and Budgeting Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) All Inclusive Financial Management Manual</td>
<td>(1) Develop an All-Inclusive Financial Management Manual</td>
<td>(1) University Council (Responsible &amp; Approves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Streamlined Chart of Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Report on investigation into identified anomalies in Irregular Expenditure and Unspent Funds Carried Forward</td>
<td>(2) Review the University Budgeting and Expenditure Authorisation Policy to capture all revenue and expenditure</td>
<td>(2) Accounting Officer (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) An All-Inclusive Financial Management Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Comprehensive &amp; Appropriate Chart of Account (COA) for the University</td>
<td>(3) Institute a comprehensive budget monitoring mechanism</td>
<td>(3) University Management (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Comprehensive Budget Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4) Develop a Comprehensive &amp; Appropriate Chart of Account (COA) for the University</td>
<td>(4) MoFED (Consulted &amp; Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) IGG Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Include all un-utilised and uncommitted funds at the end of the year, in the subsequent year’s budget and seek necessary approvals</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5) Other Stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Action(s) taken by University Council in respect of the Investigations in (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) IGG should Investigate anomalies in Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Audit Reports Indicating that University’s Financial Statements are in compliance with International Accounting Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9.16 REVENUE, GRANTS, BANK ACCOUNTS AND PROCUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(2) Strengthen the Internal Audit Function and Audit & Risk Management Committee of Council  
(3) Review and strengthen miscellaneous revenue estimation and collection procedures/guidelines to plug potential leakages.  
(4) Streamline the Grants Management System  
(5) Ensure cash withdrawal is limited to avoid the risks that are associated with such a practice.  
(6) Comprehensively review all bank accounts to identify accounts that could be closed or combined, to attain efficiency and economy  
(7) The IGG should investigate the procurement system and revenue leakages at Makerere University. | (1) University Council (Approves)  
(2) University Management (Responsible)  
(3) Accounting Officer (Responsible)  
(4) MoFPED (Consulted & Supports)  
(5) Other Stakeholders (Consulted) | Short Term | (1) Streamlined Systems for Revenue Collection, Grants Management, Procurement and Payroll  
(2) No. of Active University Bank Accounts  
(3) IGG Report  
(4) Actions taken in response to the IGG Report |
### 9.17 Makerere University Expenditure and Payroll Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streamline University Expenditure and Payroll Management</td>
<td>1. Streamline University Expenditure (Payment) System</td>
<td>1. Clean up the Payrolls</td>
<td>1. University Council (Approves)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>1. Centralised and Streamlined Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Centralised and Clean Payroll</td>
<td>2. The Payrolls should be centrally managed in the Directorate of Human Resource Management</td>
<td>2. Accounting Officer (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Amount of Funds Recovered from Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fully Operational Directorate of Legal &amp; Advisory Services</td>
<td>3. Streamline the Process of Accountability for Advances to Staff</td>
<td>3. University Bursar (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Amount of funds recovered from irregular payments as honoraria, arrears, contract staff salaries, repairs and servicing, extra load allowances, advances and Cheque Payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Recover Funds irregularly paid out to staff and suppliers.</td>
<td>4. University Management (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Amount of NSSF &amp; Taxes Arrears remitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Remit all undisputed amounts due to NSSF as they await the outcome of the court cases on the dispute.</td>
<td>5. MoFPED (Consulted &amp; Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Follow-up Reports on recovery measures against Staff with outstanding Advances and/or disciplinary action against them as provided for under the Financial Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Prioritise the payment of the unremit amounts to URA (PAYE and WHT).</td>
<td>6. University Staff (Informed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Follow-up Report on Cheque Payments not posted in the Cashbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Streamline the Commitment Control System</td>
<td>7. Other Stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Fully Operational Directorate of Legal &amp; Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Streamline the Management of Cheque Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Replace old water supply network to fix all leakages and introduce water meters to all premises to enforce close monitoring of usage of water by all the University Community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Streamline the Operations of the Directorate of Legal &amp; Advisory Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9.18 UNIVERSITY INVESTMENTS, INNOVATIONS AND FUNDING MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Deliverable(s)</th>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Key Actors (RASIC (Responsible, Approves, Supports, is Informed, is Consulted))</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversify Sources of University Funding and Secure All University Land with Proper Documentation</td>
<td>(1) Diversified Revenue Streams</td>
<td>(1) Review and Implement the Makerere University Investment Plan</td>
<td>(1) University Council (Approves)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>(1) Viable University Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Proper Documentation for All University Land</td>
<td>(2) Streamline the Process for Commercialisation of Research and Innovation</td>
<td>(2) University Management (Responsible)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Amount of Funds Contributed as Overheads from Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Streamline the Operations of Commercial Units at Makerere University</td>
<td>(3) Private Sector (Consulted &amp; Supports)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Patents, Copy Rights and Other IPR Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Streamline the Collection of Overheads on Grants as a Revenue Stream for University Operations</td>
<td>(4) Government of Uganda (Consulted, Responsible &amp; Approves)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Innovations Commercialised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Establish Structures and Systems for Resource Mobilisation. This should work closely with the Chancellor</td>
<td>(5) Other Stakeholders (Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) All University Land Secured with Proper Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Secure All University Land with Proper Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# ANNEXURES

## ANNEXURE I: LIST OF CO-OPTED STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professor Benon Basheka</td>
<td>Governance &amp; Management Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dr. Vincent Ssembatya</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Drake Kyalimpa</td>
<td>Higher Education Funding Models Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Birevu Muyinda</td>
<td>Distance/E-Learning Designer Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Ronald Bisaso</td>
<td>Higher Education Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dr. Justus Kwetegyeka</td>
<td>STEM Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. Amos Ngabirano</td>
<td>Management Information Systems Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Matovu</td>
<td>Governance &amp; Management Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. Jimrex Byamugisha</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ms. Faith Nyanwenge</td>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ms. Rachael Rwomushana</td>
<td>Legal Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Albert Ajuna</td>
<td>Research Assistant –Minute Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professor Deborah Hope Kasente</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Madina Mwagale Guloba</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. Rovincer Najjuma</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr. Edward Bwayo</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ms. Juliet Kwamboka</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ms. Irene Nyambale</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr. Peter Opio</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ms. Agnes Nanyonjo</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mr. Evarist Bainomugisha</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mr. Simon Mutuma Wamukota</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr. John Baptist Walugembe</td>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEXURE II: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF WHITE PAPER ON MCGREGOR REPORT

### A 2.1 Governance and Management

#### A 2.1.1 Higher Education Oversight Structures & Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) <strong>To ensure that quality Higher Education is achieved, the regulating body should be financially strengthened.</strong></td>
<td>UOTIA 2001 will be reviewed to provide for proper funding of the NCHE and that Government will provide sufficient funding to the Council to enable it carry out its function effectively.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Part V of UOTIA 2001 Amended (Financial provision of NCHE) is not yet amended.</td>
<td>Observed that universities do not remit the student fee to NCHE.</td>
<td>Amend UOTIA 2001/3/6 conflict of interest on the composition of NCHE membership. Institute a surcharge on institutions that delay to remit these fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) <strong>The UOTIA 2001 should be reviewed by Government to provide for proper funding of NCHE. One proposal is that each Tertiary Institution should contribute towards the cost of running the NCHE on a formula based on student enrolment.</strong></td>
<td>UOTIA 2001 will be reviewed to provide for proper funding of the NCHE and that Government will provide sufficient funding to the Council to enable it carry out its function effectively.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Delay in the UOTIA 2001 amendment.</td>
<td>Noted the delay in non-remittance of fees to NCHE and propose a surcharge on such institutions. Note delay in pending amendment of the law.</td>
<td>Expedite the amendment of the law. MoFPED should give a vote to NCHE by FY 2018/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <strong>NCHE should have its own vote or budget line with the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED).</strong></td>
<td>UOTIA 2001 will be reviewed to provide for proper funding of the NCHE and that Government will provide sufficient funding to the Council to enable it carry out its function effectively.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>The Law (UOTIA 2001) is not yet amended.</td>
<td>Noted that NCHE has the minimum conditions required to be given a vote are there.</td>
<td>Expedite the amendment of the law. MoFPED should give a vote to NCHE by FY 2018/2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) <strong>To improve the current Elective Systems of officials and top academics which has been prescribed by law, Public Universities should consider a system which combines the Search Team Approach and the Election Approach. In such a system, the Electorate would vote for a candidate they want from a list of candidates recommended by the Search Team. The proposed Electoral System would be administered by the Council with the Chancellor as the Chairman.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was amended as follows: Posts for officials and top academics will be advertised, instead of the current Elective Systems and the proposed Search Team Approach, the Council will present the Chancellor with candidates recommended by the Search Team.</td>
<td>Not yet implemented</td>
<td>The Law (UOTIA 2001) is not yet amended.</td>
<td>In agreement with the recommendation.</td>
<td>Fast track the amendment of the law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
names presented by a Search Team. two names, from which to appoint a Vice Chancellor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Councils and Senators should undertake urgent and full reviews of their own responsibilities and those of the Universities’ Top Administrators</td>
<td>Sections 30-37 of the UOTIA Act 2001 should be amended to provide for the Academic Registrar (AR) and University Secretary (US) to be responsible to the Vice Chancellor (VC) through the relevant Deputy Vice Chancellors (DVC AA) and that the third Deputy Vice Chancellor (DVC FA) post be made optional.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>The UOTIA Act 2001 has not been amended.</td>
<td>The Committee concurs with what was mentioned</td>
<td>The Committee recommended that the Act/Law should not define the organogram of the University – this should be left to the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Councils should have the autonomy to charge fees based on unit costs.</td>
<td>Government accepts the recommendation with the following amendments; Councils should have autonomy to charge fees in consultation with the Ministry of Education and Sports and with approval of Cabinet</td>
<td>UOTIA 2001 Section 41 (1c) provides for University Councils to fix scales of fees and boarding charges. But this is not yet operationalised.</td>
<td>When Council increases fees, students strike, &amp; Government interventions amount to staying the status quo.</td>
<td>The Committee agrees with the proposal that a fixed reasonable retainer be paid</td>
<td>The University Council should have full authority to set fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The attendance allowance and retainer fees of Council Members should be reviewed to address the current unreasonably high allowances and retainer fees.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>National Council for Higher Education (NCHE) has not provided the guidelines.</td>
<td>The Committee agrees with the proposal that a fixed reasonable retainer be paid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Members of Councils and Senates should be fully committed to the functions of their Universities.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Under-funding, work overload, understaffing.</td>
<td>The Committee agrees with the proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 2.1.2 University Council

To consolidate and harmonise the dissemination of Science and Technology, the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) should be located in the same Ministry as the tertiary/institutions that create and disseminate this knowledge. The state could plan to establish a MoHESTI Research Centre.

Recommendation was accepted. Partly implemented. There is now a Line Ministry of Science and Technology & Innovation.

Higher Education (universities) and Information Technology (IT) were left out yet Universities are the key drivers of innovation and IT is a key tool for innovation. Restructure the Ministry of Science Technology and Innovations into the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Technology & Innovation.

To consolidate and harmonise the dissemination of Science and Technology, the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) should be located in the same Ministry as the tertiary/institutions that create and disseminate this knowledge. The state could plan to establish a MoHESTI Research Centre.
### A 2.2 Information and Communication Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Universities should create efficient and reliable MIS to keep all stakeholders informed and data processing and retention be drastically improved.</td>
<td>Recommendation is accepted with an addition that Universities collect and utilise the data.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Inadequate funding and under-staffing.</td>
<td>The Committee agrees that the current ICT system at Makerere leaves a lot to desired</td>
<td>The Committee recommends the implementation of an Integrated ERP System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Staff including Senior Staff should be provided with ICT Training and to ensure effective planning and management.</td>
<td>Recommendation is accepted with an addition that Universities collect and utilise the data.</td>
<td>Partly Done</td>
<td>Inadequate funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee recommends that this should be a Human Resource requirement that all staff acquire these skill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A 2.3 Human Resource Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performance. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible rewarded but poor performers should not be re-appointed.</td>
<td>Recommendation was amended as follows: Human resources management systems should review the quality of staff performances. Good performers should be acknowledged and where possible, rewarded but poor performers should not be re-appointed.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Unconducive work environment, limited funding and low staff morale.</td>
<td>The Committee is in agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Terms of employment in Public Universities should change from permanent and pensionable to contracts of limited durations, say 3-5 years renewable on good performance.</td>
<td>Academic Staff in Public Universities will be maintained on permanent and pensionable terms and appropriate criteria for their promotion will be put in place.</td>
<td>Pending.</td>
<td>UOTIA 2001 Act does not provide for pensionable terms for all University staff in Public Universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Universities should Recruit on Contract Terms for All Non-teaching Staff &amp; Academic Staff below the Rank of Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Staff Appraisal system should be universal, regular and effective with feedback. Students should be involved in the appraisal and assessment of Academic Staff and should have a right of appeal against academic mis-assessment. (we will consult our recommendations under governance)</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending.</td>
<td>Weak management and monitoring systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) We believe that honest staff appraisal procedures, supported by improvements in working conditions</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with adjustment to bring cut-out staff appeal besides students appeal. Systems will</td>
<td>Pending.</td>
<td>Unprofessional conduct among some staff, inadequate.</td>
<td>In agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and facilities could quickly begin to restore the staff morale and cure widespread distrust and disenchantment.

be put in place to ensure professional commitment of staff to basic obligations such as regular attendance, punctuality, meeting deadlines and doing full day’s work.

mentoring, unconducive environment.

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Problem Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) Councils and Senior Management should make every effort to heal sharp antagonism between academics and administrators, through open discussion of major problems, followed by careful advice. Clear divisions of responsibility should achieve better cooperation.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>On-going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Government should revise the retirement age for Academic Staff to 70 years and council should be at liberty to give contract beyond statutory age.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with the following addition: “University Councils should be at liberty to give contract beyond statutory age”</td>
<td>Policy put in place for Professors and Associate Professors wishing to stay can apply for Contracts till age of 70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) All appointments of part-time staff should be made according to Council approved procedures, and be approved and recorded by Central Administration.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Policy put in place for part-time and temporary contracts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A 2.4 Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Makerere University in particular should undergo an overhaul of its administrative structure and style, including financial administration.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending.</td>
<td>Awaiting amendment of OUTIA 2001.</td>
<td>Concur with recommendation. This should be in cognizance of the Collegiate System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Management training and re-training are urgently required.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Regular change of administrators due to short term contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mismanagement of IGF from private fees at Makerere University should be investigated by a respectable firm of auditor/accountants</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Not yet implemented</td>
<td>Inadequate funding</td>
<td>This has been well handled under our recommendations for the Finance Sub-Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) All Public Universities should revert to budget lines agreed upon by Government since the subvention block grants of funding from the state has not in the past been managed well to fund key academic elements of the University.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>This was handled by our finance sub-Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) The Government should increase funding to Public Universities to match the surging numbers of students created by the UPE and USE policies as well as population growth.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints.</td>
<td>Government funding is still low Government thru ADB HEST Project is improving facilities Makerere has also taken a step to reduce on the student numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) The Government should also fund research in Universities on a sustainable basis.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Not yet implemented</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Ministry of Education and Sports allocations to the Tertiary sub-sector should be raised to at least 20% per year.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Not yet implemented</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUs should continue to expand areas of income generation to more sources including endowments, alumni, research consultancies and partnerships, to reinforce public sources funding.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td>In agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University councils should have overall responsibility of allocation of all IGF in PU which should be contained in an integrated budget.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with amendment as follows: “University Councils will have overall responsibility of allocation of all Internally Generated Funds in Public Universities which should be contained in an integrated budget…”</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>Weak governance and management systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Universities should determine levels of consolidated pay packages. Care, however, should be taken not to kill the initiative and energy of money making units and individuals.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with amendment as follows: “…Public Universities should determine levels of consolidated pay packages”.</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>Universities don’t have the mandate to determine levels of consolidated pay packages. It is the role of Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The present system or culture/practice of paying wide ranging “Allowances” should be reviewed and drastically reduced. Universities should not pay allowances for duties which form part of staff contract responsibilities of an employee during normal working days – including meetings.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Staff resistance, and inadequate remuneration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUs should phase out the payment of non-pedagogical allowances for government – sponsored students. Money saved from these could be part of the seed funds for the loan scheme.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendations was not accepted. A study will be undertaken to guide the loan scheme.</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>No evidence of study undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government should introduce an equitable student loan scheme based on a MEANS TEST on the lines of those</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>Partially done</td>
<td>Loan scheme only caters for Science students.</td>
<td>Loan scheme should be expanded to cover Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Acknowledgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Councils and Senior Administrators will ensure that, through reformed procedures, University funds are efficiently and fairly allocated to all areas.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Lack of implementation of reformed procedures.</td>
<td>This is not happening now but the reforms are very necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) PUs will design integrated budgets to fund courses which are critical for social economic transformation in the country.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Resistance to change; universities insist on teaching everything.</td>
<td>Government has funded programmes which are critical, it has funded research in critical areas of Science, and also enhanced salaries of staff in the critical areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Government should apply to the World Bank and other donors for emergency funds for universities' infrastructure development, and for creating facilities that match with the surging student enrolment numbers.</td>
<td>On-going under HEST Project</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints HEST only handles limited infrastructure.</td>
<td>Acknowledge government and with ADB HEST support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A 2.5 Student Affairs & Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Makerere should consolidate improvements in its administration and teaching/learning processes before matching students with facilities.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with the following addition: “All Public Universities students’ enrolment should match with facilities according to the NCHE benchmarks”</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Slow pace due to budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Government started implementing this recommendation thru HEST project of ADB</td>
<td>(1) Makerere should have a ceiling on student enrolment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Makerere and Kyambogo should match students and facilities within a “consolidation period” of five years before embarking on new programmes or admitting more students than those who match available facilities.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with the following addition: “All Public Universities students’ enrolment should match with facilities according to the NCHE benchmarks”.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Slow pace due to budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Decongest Makerere University by Focusing CEES, COBAMS, CHUSS on Graduate Training &amp; Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Councils and Senior Administrators should thoroughly review arrangements for the security and health care of students, living on or, near University campuses.</td>
<td>Recommendation was amended as follows: Councils and Senior Administrators should thoroughly review arrangements for the security and health care of students, living on or off University campuses.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Students’ resistance to hire designated hostels, claiming they are expensive.</td>
<td>University should interact more with hostel owners to improve the security and health conditions of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Money saved should be directed to other core academic activities.</td>
<td>Universities will privatise the Management Of Halls Of Residence and service therein.</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>Lack of clear policy and stakeholders’ resistance</td>
<td>Feeding in halls has been privatised, and some halls have privatised cleaning services</td>
<td>The process of privatising needs to be well brought out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic Affairs

### Observation by Rwendeire Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Observation by Rwendeire Committee</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Current Implementation Status</th>
<th>Government Position (White Paper)</th>
<th>Recommendations by Rwendeire Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Except for cases of affirmative action in case of females that is in place in most Public Universities, all students should be admitted on merit including children of Academic Staff. While the Universities can waive fees for children of Academic Staff, permitting them entry on lower grades is academic favouritism and therefore unfair to other stakeholders who equally have an interest in Public Universities.</td>
<td>Except for cases of affirmative action in case of females, talented sports persons, persons with disabilities and district quota that are in place in Public Universities, all students should be admitted on merit, including children of staff.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Done</td>
<td>Inadequate funding to re-examine the curricula at all levels.</td>
<td>Government will re-examine the curricula at all levels of education. Universities will be required to revisit their respective curricula particularly in the first year of the degree programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need to raise the library budget to the acceptable level of 10% of University budgets. Senior Finance Administrators should ensure that the annual library fee paid by students was diverted to pay incentive for staff.</td>
<td>University should put in place a budget for maintenance of structures.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Library fees charged from students was diverted to pay incentive for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Public Universities should move full-time to e-learning assessment and research.</td>
<td>University should undertake rehabilitation, modernisation and expansion of infrastructure in Public universities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace (HEST Project).</td>
<td>Ongoing at a slow pace (HEST Project).</td>
<td>University is implementing this through the ADB project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to raise the library budget to the acceptable level of 10% of University budgets. Senior Finance Administrators should ensure that the annual library fee paid by students was diverted to pay incentive for staff.</td>
<td>University should put in place a budget for maintenance of structures.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints</td>
<td>Library fees charged from students was diverted to pay incentive for staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendation(s)

1. Except for cases of affirmative action in case of females, talented sports persons, persons with disabilities and district quota that are in place in Public Universities, all students should be admitted on merit, including children of staff.
2. A certain percentage of sports people should be given appropriate to have sponsorship.
3. All Public Universities should move full-time to e-learning assessment and research.
4. Governments should continue its affirmative funding of science and technology students because these discipline are key to economic development.
5. All Public Universities should move full-time to e-learning assessment and research.
6. To ensure the quality of Higher Education in many of the Faculties and Departments, government should undertake rehabilitation, modernisation and expansion of infrastructure in Public universities.
7. University should put in place a budget for maintenance of structures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action/Status</th>
<th>Budgetary Constraints</th>
<th>Actions/Proposed Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) Public Universities should put emphasis on provision of functional laboratory/workshops.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>There is need for deliberate intervention on this. Funds should be availed to acquire items needed for practical work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Government should set up a National Training Centre of Instrument Technicians. Such a centre should also be able to offer consultancy on procurement of scientific equipment. Universities should establish interdisciplinary research laboratories.</td>
<td>Government will establish or transform one of the Technical Colleges to become a National Training Centre of Instrumentation Technicians.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>In agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) The trend of turning non-University tertiary institutions into universities is not advisable. The Government should create a layer of other tertiary institutions to produce Technicians needed for poverty alleviation tasks.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted. The Government will strengthen a layer of Tertiary Institutions to produce Technicians needed for poverty alleviation tasks. For every graduate there should be ten graduates of Tertiary Institutions.</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>In agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) For every Engineer/Scientist, there should be ten Technicians meaning that for every University Graduate there should be ten graduates of other tertiary institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budgetary constraints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Recommend cautious expansion of distance education by Public Universities bearing in mind that the creation of new specific distance learning materials is expensive in terms of staffing and facilities.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted. Expansion of distance education will be implemented by Public Universities in phases.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>The current external distance programme in Makerere has increased its enrolment to 4000 students. E-learning mode should be embraced by other courses/programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Preparations for an Open University should begin and materialise within the medium term.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted. An Open University will be immediately established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Public Universities (PU) should develop stronger involvement in Public/Private R&amp;D to deploy the full potential of our Science &amp; Technology graduate so as to contribute to national development/economic growth.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted.</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>Lack of Technology Transfer Centres and Industrial Parks in Uganda, and we have a small industrial base. Committee observed that Makerere is doing relatively well in Health Sciences, industry and agriculture e.g. Kiira motors, PIBID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) PUs should provide more funding.</td>
<td>Universities and Government will</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for Research and Publication. PUs should do more basic research.</td>
<td>Provide more funding, training for research and publication, in accordance with African Union Lagos Plan of Action whereby 3% of GDP of each country should be used for this purpose. Public Universities will develop stronger involvement in public/private research.</td>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Uganda’s GDP is 2.8 trillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and Government will provide more funding, training for Research And Publication, in accordance with African Union Lagos Plan of Action whereby 3% of GDP of each country should be used for this purpose. Public Universities will develop stronger involvement in public/private research.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td>MISR started PHD programme with support from Carnegie foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and Government will provide more funding, training for research and publication, in accordance with African Union Lagos Plan of Action whereby 3% of GDP of each country should be used for this purpose. Public Universities will develop stronger involvement in public/private research.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td>SPS was upgraded to Directorate of Graduate Training and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities and Government will provide more funding, training for research and publication, in accordance with African Union Lagos Plan of Action whereby 3% of GDP of each country should be used for this purpose. Public Universities will develop stronger involvement in public/private research.</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace.</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation was accepted. Government has resumed funding for Postgraduate students in fields critical to socio-economic transformation.</td>
<td>Not implemented.</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td>Government has initiated postgraduate training in MDAs targeting gross sectors of Oil and Gas, Industrialisation and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Makerere has 146.5bn for research (92.7% of funds are from donors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendation was accepted</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace</td>
<td>Budgetary constraints and lack of clear policy.</td>
<td>NCHE expects to get more funding in the budget year 2018/19 and that this issue will be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) NCHE should come up with a flexible system to permit upward and downward mobility as well as transfer of students amongst programmes and institutions of tertiary education.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Faculties and Departments should not be permitted to start academic programmes which are beyond their subject mandate and demonstrated competence. Accordingly, the School of Education at Makerere should focus on training pedagogy, and creating knowledge in that discipline, not to duplicate academic programmes whose competences lie in other faculties.</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted with the following amendment: “Faculties and Departments should not be permitted to start academic programmes which are beyond their subject mandate and demonstrated competence”</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Lack of clear policy and inadequate implementation mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) PUs should strive to establish close working links with the Private Sector in research and development, sharing of facilities, funding-raising and co-operation in capital building projects and investment</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace</td>
<td>Lack of clear policy framework. There are policies in place in relation to this link but not well followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Makerere University Business School will develop further as a degree awarding Tertiary Institution and move gradually towards University status, through legal structures in accordance with the Universities and Other tertiary Institutions Act 2001</td>
<td>Recommendation was accepted</td>
<td>On-going at a slow pace</td>
<td>MUBS stakeholders’ resistance to operationalise the degree-awarding status in preference to the University status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEXURE III: SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES BENCHMARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Performance Area</th>
<th>Local Benchmarking</th>
<th>Regional Benchmarking</th>
<th>External Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of government in establishment and management of Universities</td>
<td>(1) Universities established by Government (MUBS, MUST, UMI and Kyambogo) and PIBID project</td>
<td>(1) Most Universities visited in South Africa and in East Africa were established by Government.</td>
<td>(1) All Universities visited in Germany, UK and Sweden were established by government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 100% government funding and appointment of BMC leadership (PIBID)</td>
<td>(2) The governance of South African Universities is based on the terms of Higher Education Act, Act 101 of 1997 as amended.</td>
<td>(2) 100% government funding through five year strategic plans and budgets for academic, non-academic and development programmes in all Germany Universities visited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) University budget preparation is guided by the government budget guide and policy. (University of Der-es-saalam) in East Africa.</td>
<td>(3) Appointment of top leadership and provision of qualification assessment criteria for employment of professors and Senior Staff (Uppsala University) in Sweden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viable governance model</td>
<td>(1) More interaction between top management and guild leadership (MUBS and UCU)</td>
<td>(1) Autonomous University Council and operation within government policy guidelines (Wits and SU)</td>
<td>(4) Vetting of University leadership (Oxford University and UCL) in UK and IITs in Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) An effective evaluation tool for Council members (UMI)</td>
<td>(2) Full representation of all stakeholders on various University Committees (SU, UP, UCT, and Wits) in South Africa.</td>
<td>(5) Fixation of tuition fees and payment of staff salaries at IITs in Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Decentralisation of funds and authority to schools and involvement of all stakeholders in the budgeting process (MUBS)</td>
<td>(3) Existence of a Board of Residence that handles University’ residence.</td>
<td>(6) Government loan scheme (Taylor’s) and sponsorships (Monash) in Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Collaboration with Private Universities (Limkokwing, Taylor’s and Monash in Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Constitutional right for all citizens to access free education at all levels and assured job placement upon graduation (USA Cuba).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic affairs and management systems</td>
<td>Funding and resource mobilisation models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Evaluation appraisal for all facilitators and staff are conducted annually in private Universities visited.</td>
<td>(1) 100% government funding (PIBID) through MoFPED on quarterly basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Students who have not attended class at 70%,75%, and at least two thirds of the time are not allowed to sit exams in private Universities, (UMI, UCU and UMU) respectively.</td>
<td>(2) 43% government funding (Kyambogo University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Programmes reviewed every three years (UMI).</td>
<td>(3) Another major source of funding is NTR (MUBS, UMI and Kyambogo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Excellent research, high academic standards and commitment to social justice (UCT)</td>
<td>(4) 31.3% government funding (SU).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Research centres and centres of excellence, offering financial aid to financially challenged students (UP &amp; Wits),</td>
<td>(5) Another major source of funding is grants and contracts 24% (SU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Teaching excellence for more than a century, highly qualified academics, Alumni involvement which maintains the standards of the University, well stocked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Maintenance of the quality of educational institutions and their degrees through accreditation, high level of autonomy for schools and vying for students, faculty and funding in USA Cuba.</td>
<td>(1) 100% government funding through five year strategic plans and budgets for academic, non-academic and development programmes (LMU, Hohenheim University and University of Bayreuth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Use of biometric machine to register student attendance (Delhi) and entry examination for admission to undergraduate and postgraduate studies, (IITs) in Asia</td>
<td>(2) Another major source of funding is third party sources accounting for more than 40% of total government support for the Germany Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Distance education and Off campus colleges to decongest campuses (UCL) in the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A collegiate system of study and an online library facility at Oxford University in the UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs and management strategies</td>
<td>Library facilities which provide a various services (UP&amp; Wits) in South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Less congestion at Campus that is; (MUBS, UCU &amp; UMU),</td>
<td>(4) Research that puts the University on top of other research institutions in South Africa (UP),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Students are allowed to share grievance with whoever they feel comfortable within Management (UMI)</td>
<td>(5) Prestigious chairs and centres of excellence, assessing of lecturers’ performance by students, and extensive restructuring of faculties (Wits) in South Africa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Guild election conducted by E-Voting (Kyambogo)</td>
<td>(6) Quality assurance of academic programmes by the Senate (UP, SU, &amp; Wits) in South Africa &amp; UDSM in East Africa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 75% Wi-Fi coverage in the University,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Induction programme, counseling services and student tribunal (UCU),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) At UMU, there is a Students’ Union and Alumni Offices, Private hostels are directly under the Dean’s Office and there are standards they must follow, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Provision of professional services, an extensive advising approach of education to students and maintenance of small class sizes at Bayreuth in Germany.

(6) Student Support Management Systems and Student Unions for quality enhancement and quality assurance at Uppsala University in Sweden and Student representative bodies which work to improve study conditions at Hohenheim in Germany.

**Student Representative Councils** for representation of student interests at various academic Committees (SU, Wits, UP & UCT) in South Africa.

**University accreditation of residences outside campus (Wits)** in South Africa.

**Food service department division and extensive state-of-art-sport facilities (UP), strategic placement of cafeteria services around campuses , operation of University fleet for transportation of students and Campus wealth and health centres which support student needs (Wits & UDSM)**

**Effective policy on code of**

For all the Germany Universities visited, the government runs a non-profit organisation called Deutsches Studentwerk (Germany National Association for Student Affairs-DSW) to cater for student affairs. DSW runs University cafeterias, dormitories, and provides a programme for funding students combining loans and grants for less wealth students.

**Gender equality policies** are Honheim’s, and Bayreuth’s priority that cuts across the entire Universities.

Bayreuth University has bodies like Student Complaint Management Policy and Procedures and Student Academic Grievance Procedures to resolve student grievance.

Oxford University offers a range of services to students and these include student welfare and support services, student counseling services, and career service.

The Provost has power to suspend a student from any or all his/her studies in the college and to exclude him/her.
has a student’s cafeteria where students pay and are fed which is almost compulsory.

(7) At UCU, all guild leadership is as well trained to handle counseling.

(8) Sponsoring various researches at both Masters and PhD levels, provision of state of the art laboratory services to carry out various researches and allocation to both Research Assistants and Research Fellows supervisors from within the organisation and helps them in getting supervisors from respective Universities (PIBID).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lineup of the academic programmes against the socio-economic development needs and priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Programmes are designed basing on the current government policies, (UMI), at UCU, community worship is a must and at UMU, community engagement is closely linked to research and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PIBID has a vision of having a state-of-the-art banana processing enterprises in Uganda producing valued added Matooke products with competitive market strength both locally and globally manned by rural farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Promotion of research output; SU is the most research –productive academic institution in the country. Faculty involvement in community engagement and community development (UP), provision of professional development which has positioned the University to national and international expectations of producing high calibre graduates, global citizens and professionals(Wits) in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Lending support to state governments, quasi-government organisations, multinationals, SMEs industries in enhancing their creativity (Limkokwing), industrial partnerships with different industries (IITs, Delhi, Monash and Taylor’s) in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) There is close coordination between the policies and strategies implemented by the country to ensure the educational development and economic and social progress it requires, the national-level manpower planning for all sectors to forestall unemployment of University graduates and the deliberate mainstreaming of the national values of Cuba in higher education curricular in USA Cuba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Student Association that serves a means of communication between students, academics and administrative authorities of the University (Monash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Most Germany Universities are involved in research collaborations (LMU, Hohenheim University, and University of Bayreuth) which offers an opportunity of close contacts between institutions and for establishment of new cooperation, promotes conducting new research on fundamental aspects of natural sciences and humanities while developing real world applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Lending support to state governments, quasi-government organisations, multinationals, SMEs industries in enhancing their creativity (Limkokwing), industrial partnerships with different industries (IITs, Delhi, Monash and Taylor’s) in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Campus radio station for broadcasting news and music and as a means of communication and an Amphitheatre where everyone can hang out. (Limkokwing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from the college and its precincts and other buildings and premises owned by the college at (UCL)

(6) Loans are given to students for their upkeep, students are given an opportunity to participate in evaluation of development work, students are allowed to report to whoever they feel comfortable within top management when subjected to sexual harassment, a four stage grieve management process and Students Unions each with its local ombudsman that tackle questions that concern all students at Uppsala University.

(7) Free transport for students to different destination, student unions for student welfare, and a very strong student Alumni who share their experience with campus students (FTMS)

(8) Student Association that serves a means of communication between students, academics and administrative authorities of the University (Monash)

(9) Campus radio station for broadcasting news and music and as a means of communication and an Amphitheatre where everyone can hang out. (Limkokwing)
research collaborations which offers an opportunity of close contacts between institutions and for establishment of new cooperation, promotes conducting new research on fundamental aspects of natural sciences and humanities while developing real world applications.
ANNEXURE IV: PROFILE OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

HON. DR ABEL J. J. RWENDEIRE is substantially the Deputy Chairperson of National Planning Authority (NPA) and he holds a Ph.D. in Biochemistry obtained in 1985 from the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. He joined NPA in July 2008 following his four year tenure as a Managing Director (2002-2006) at the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation, (UNIDO), in Vienna, Austria. He was responsible for the formulation, implementation and evaluation of innovative programmatic initiatives in Industrial Promotion and Technology; Agro-Industries; Small and Medium Enterprises; Energy and Cleaner Production.

Prior to his engagement in UNIDO, Dr Rwendeire was a Member of Parliament representing the people of Rubanda County East constituency in Kabale District from 1996 to 2002. During this time he served also as a Minister of State for Tourism, Trade and Industry (1996-1998 and 2000-2002); Minister of State for Higher Education (1998-2000) in the Ministry of Education and Sports.

Before joining Politics, he had contributed significantly to the development and management of technical and vocational education when he was the Principal of Uganda Polytechnic Kyambogo (1992-1996) in the Ministry of Education and Sports. He forged mutually supportive partnerships with private sector players by promoting linkages between industry and the Polytechnic. Dr Rwendeire taught Biochemistry at Makerere University from 1986-1992 during which time he served as Secretary General of MUASA and a Makerere University Council member representing Academic Staff.

LADY JUSTICE KETRAH K. KATUNGUKA is a Judge of the High Court of Uganda. She has previously served in various capacities including as a Commissioner Contracts and Negotiations in the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Registrar Electricity Disputes Tribunal, a member of a number of Commissions of Inquiry and other National Committees, among others. She is also an International Certified Consultant on PPP.
JOHN F S MUWANGA. MSC, FCCA, CPA(U): Mr. Muwanga has 14 years of private sector experience having worked with Coopers & Lybrand in the London (UK) office, Lusaka & Kitwe (Zambia) and Lilongwe (Malawi). He was an Associate Partner of Coopers & Lybrand since 1987 to 1993. His 22 years’ public sector experience has been since 1994 in Uganda working as a consultant on a World Bank project, then subsequently held line positions as the Accountant General, before being appointed as the Auditor General of Uganda in 2001. He has served on many international and local committees, most notably on (i) the Committee on Budget & Finance of the International Criminal Court based in The Hague (ii) member of the United Nations Independent Audit Advisory Committee, (iii) currently Chairman of the African Union’s Board of External Auditors, based in Addis

TIMOTHY N. MUTEKANGA LWANGA is a graduate B.COM (Accounting) from Makerere University, a qualified accountant, auditor and a former Member of Parliament and Cabinet of Uganda. He is currently a key member of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Budget (PACOB).

ENG. GERALD LUMU, is a graduate of Mechanical Engineering Science Degree from the University of Nairobi. He has over 30 years’ experience in applications of engineering and management. He is alumni of AOTS JAPAN. He is currently employed as the Deputy Managing Director Luwero Industries Limited, a subsidiary of the National Enterprise Corporation, a Ministry of Defense company. He previously worked as the company’s engineer Chief Engineer. He is trained in ordnance engineering and is a practicing ballistician. He was responsible for the training of fresh graduate engineers in very highly specialized areas of the defense industry. Has designed specialized training programs for the engineering trainees. He also has considerable experience in business management and has undertaken specialized industrial training in there relevant areas as of specialization overseas. He also worked in Nairobi, Kenya and held senior positions in the mechanical engineering field. He worked at Galsheet (K) ltd and Insteel (K) limited as Plant Engineer and Chief Engineer respectively.
Dr. Proscovia Namubiru Ssentamu Heads the Quality Assurance Department at Uganda Management Institute. Prior to joining UMI, Proscovia was a Lecturer at the School of Education, Makerere University between 1996 and 2010. She holds a PhD in Education (Bayreuth, Germany), a Master of Arts in Curriculum Studies (London), a Master of Education in Curriculum Studies (Makerere) and a BA/Ed (English Language and Literature in English (Makerere). She also holds a Postgraduate Diploma in Education Technology (University of Cape Town), Postgraduate Diploma in HRM (UMI), and a Graduate Certificate in Quality Assurance (Melbourne). She has participated in several education-related assignments at national, regional and international levels in curriculum development, teaching and learning, quality assurance and education research.

PAUL ISAAC MUSASIZI is the Chief Executive Office of Kiira Motors Corporation and an Alumnus of Makerere University. Paul is an Engineer with Vast Experience in Systems Engineering on several cutting-edge Technology Interventions in Uganda. Paul has a rich portfolio of International Science and Technology Practice collaborating with premier STI Leaders in Europe and United States of America. Paul served as an Academician Resident at Makerere University the Oldest and Premier University in Uganda, contributing to Scholarly and Innovation Programs in several EAC Institutions. In his Role as CEO Kiira Motors Corportation, Paul is at the Forefront of championing Mission Vehicles made in Uganda and decarbonized Mass Mobility Solutions for Urban Centre in Uganda. Paul is also a member of the Board of Directors of the National Enterprise Corporation.

AKISOPHEL KISOLO (PhD) is a Nuclear Physicist with a PhD (Makerere, 2003) and a MSc. in Radiation Physics (University of St. Andrews, 1985). For over two decades he has been actively teaching, supervising and conducting research at Makerere University in atomic and nuclear physics, and peaceful applications of nuclear science and technology. He heads the Nuclear and Radiation Physics research group at Makerere and has published several scientific papers in peer
reviewed journals. From 1997 to 1998, he was the founding Dean, Faculty of Science and Education and Member of the Council, Busitema University. From 2013 Akisophel has been a Member and in 2017, the Chairperson of the Governing Council, Uganda Technical College, Elgon.

In 2009, Akisophel was appointed the pioneer Chairperson of the Atomic Energy Council (AEC). AEC is the national regulator of practices involving peaceful applications of atomic energy, nuclear science and technology. The Council with the support of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development have nurtured AEC to an effective nuclear regulator with 32 full time staff in relatively a short time. He has been an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Consultant and a national counterpart of several IAEA projects for peaceful applications of nuclear science and technology in Uganda. He is a member of the Steering Committee of the Forum for Nuclear Regulatory Bodies in Africa. From 1997 to 2009 he was the Chief Radiation Safety Officer and Head of the National Radiation Protection Service.

REV. DR. FLORENCE ISABIRYE MURANGA, has served as: an associate Chaplain at St. Francis Chapel, Makerere University for over seven years, a founding Faculty member of the Department of Food Science, Technology and Nutrition at Makerere University and to date, she is the research team leader and founding Director of the Presidential Initiative on Banana Industrial Development (PIBID) Project.

She is the pioneer winner of the Presidential Scientific Innovation Excellence Award for the 2005/06 Presidential Science Award Cycle, and has also been recognised among the top women of year-2006 by the Management Forum of the British Council, Uganda. She holds a Degree in Chemistry and Biochemistry from Makerere University, an MSc in Food Science (Food Option) at the University of Reading, U.K. and a PhD in Biochemistry from Makerere University.

She has also served as a visiting Professor/Research Fellow to a number of institutions including, the University of Wisconsin Madison and University of Cornell in the US and
University of Bonn, Germany. She has served on a number of governing councils/Boards of Institutions of higher learning and government bodies

She has been listed as a member in the Institute of Food Technologies (IFT) and the Third World Organizations for Women in Science (TWOWS). She has also filed and obtained a total of five patents and a trademark from her research and development work. She is the author of a children’s book and is due to submit for publishing a book on basics of Food & Nutrition for every Ugandan Household and a Volume on developments on the triploid Acuminata East African Highland Bananas (Matooke) Varieties.
Members of the Committee during the Report Writing Retreat